

# The Review of English Studies

---

VOL. I.—No. 3.

JULY 1925.

---

## THE EVIDENCE OF THEATRICAL PLOTS FOR THE HISTORY OF THE ELIZABETHAN STAGE

BY W. W. GREG

THEATRICAL Plots are documents giving the skeleton outlines of plays, scene by scene, for use in the theatre, a small group of which has survived from the last twelve or fifteen years of Elizabeth's reign. Though the object for which they were prepared is, from internal evidence, pretty obvious, their exact nature has been the subject of some misapprehension, and it is only of recent years that their full significance has been recognised.

The known Plots number seven, and were printed more than a hundred years ago in the early "Variorum" editions of Shakespeare, with the exception of three which are in a more or less fragmentary condition. These were most likely equally available though not thought worthy of record. But the early critics made little attempt at interpretation, and Steevens' suggestion that *The Seven Deadly Sins* may have consisted only of dumb-show and chorus hardly indicates a very close study of the document.

Serious criticism began with Collier, who, in 1831, maintained that the Plots were scenarios of impromptu plays imitated from the Italian *commedia dell' arte*. It seems clear that this was no more than a guess based on the general character of the documents, though he supported it by certain arguments from *The Seven Deadly Sins*. These were, in fact, quite beside the point, and it is significant that Collier overlooked the one really relevant piece of evidence in favour of his view, namely, that *The Dead Man's Fortune*

does contain characters—Pantaloon, etc.—undoubtedly borrowed from the improvised comedies of Italy. This, however, does not by itself take us very far, and Collier's theory is now known to be erroneous.

It is unfortunate that the early critics who printed the complete Plots should have overlooked or rejected the fragments, for these include one of *The Battle of Alcazar*, and this well-known play of George Peele's, which was printed in 1594, was assuredly not composed extempore. The Plot was acquired with others by the British Museum in 1836, and was published in facsimile by Halliwell in 1860, but this did not prevent Collier reproducing his account of the matter without material alteration in 1879. It is perhaps more surprising to find his view endorsed by Sir A. W. Ward so late as 1899—an interesting example of how evidence is sometimes treated by eminent historians.

It is clear to us now that there was nothing exceptional about the plays for which Plots survive. Although we are without external information on the point we may suppose that these were prepared for the guidance of actors and others in the playhouse, to remind them when and in what characters they were to appear, what properties were required, and what noises were to be made behind the scenes. The necessity for some such guide would be evident in a repertory theatre, and we may feel assured that the Plot was exhibited in a place convenient for ready reference during performance. There seems, indeed, every probability that documents similar in general character to those we possess were usual, if not universal, in Elizabethan playhouses. At the same time the extant Plots differ to some extent in detail, and we cannot of course be sure how far the few we possess are typical of the many that have presumably perished. Further evidence as to their precise nature can only be obtained from a close study of the documents themselves. This is a pretty investigation, the results of which I hope to be able to publish before long, but for the moment I wish rather to consider the light which the casts revealed in the Plots throw upon the history of the companies to which they are supposed to belong, and conversely that thrown by the history of the companies upon the interpretation and dating of the Plots. These are clearly problems antecedent to any minute study of the characteristics of the documents themselves. And in particular I wish to examine the use made of the evidence by Dr. Chambers in his recent work on *The Elizabethan*

*Stage*, since there are points upon which after careful consideration I am unable fully to agree with the views he has there advanced.

The first point at which the evidence of the Plots touches on general stage history is the difficult problem of the relations of the Admiral's and Strange's companies from 1589 to 1594. Some sort of association between the two bodies of actors is admitted, and before attempting to bring to bear the evidence of the Plots, I will state as clearly and briefly as I can what appears to be Dr. Chambers' view of the history and nature of that association.

The earliest suggestion of anything of the sort is in the winter of 1588-9, when one Symons, an actor or tumbler who certainly at one time led Strange's men, appears to have been at Court with a company which is described as the Admiral's. A year later, however, in November 1589, the two companies are found performing at different inns in the City. Again a year later, in December 1590 and February 1591, a company performed at Court which one set of official documents calls Strange's and another the Admiral's; while the provincial records of 1591-4 contain frequent mention of the two companies, sometimes separately, sometimes in conjunction, sometimes even in association with other bodies. Lastly, in May 1593, the register of the Privy Council preserves a licence granted to "Edward Allen, servant to the right honorable the Lord Highe Admiral, William Kemp, Thomas Pope, John Hemminges, Augustine Phillipps and Georg Brian, being al one companie, servauntes to our verie good . . . Lord the Lord Strainge".

From these facts Dr. Chambers draws what seems the obvious inference, namely, that there began in 1591 at latest some sort of association between the two companies which lasted till the re-sorting of the dramatic organisations in the spring of 1594. His own words had best be quoted.\* In 1590-1, he says, "the Admiral's were with Burbadge at the Theatre, and there I conceive that the residue of Strange's, deserted by Symons, had joined them. If they were too many for the house, we know that the Curtain was available as an

\* In one place (ii. 120) he summarises his view as follows: "This amalgamation of Strange's and the Admiral's, tentative perhaps in 1588-9, and conclusive, if not in 1589-90, at any rate in 1590-1, lasted till 1594". I cannot think this sentence happy, since it would seem to imply knowledge of an amalgamation, which may have been only tentative in 1588-9, but which grew closer with time and became complete the following year, or at latest in 1590-1. But we have seen that the evidence affords no more than a hint of possible co-operation in 1588-9, the facts of 1589-90 are definitely against the supposition, and it is only in 1590-1 that any clear indication of amalgamation emerges.

'easer'. After the quarrel with Burbadge in May 1591, the two companies probably went together to the Rose" (ii. 120). And again: "I suspect that in 1589 or 1590 they [the Admiral's] were practically dissolved, and this view is confirmed by the fact that their most important play [*Tamburlaine*] was allowed to get into the hands of the printers. [Edward] Alleyn, with the help of his brother [John], bought up the properties, and allied himself with Lord Strange's men, and so far as the Admiral's continued to exist at all for the next few years, it was almost entirely in and through him that it did so. After a financial quarrel with James Burbadge in May 1591, the combined companies moved to the Rose" (ii. 138).

Assuming this combination, it is important to know the name by which the joint company passed. The licence of 1593 is quite explicit on the point: the actors named formed "al one companie, servaunts to . . . the Lord Strainge" in spite of Alleyn being individually "servant to . . . the Lord Highe Admiral". "So far as Court records are concerned, the company seems to have been regarded as Strange's", says Dr. Chambers (ii. 120), and again: "Technically, it would seem that it was the Admiral's who were merged in Strange's men. It is the latter and not the former who generally appear in official documents during the period" (ii. 136). Of course, we may allow that the personal popularity of Edward Alleyn, who retained his status as servant to the Lord Admiral, and the former distinguished career of the Admiral's men may have led to an occasional retention of the name, and we have seen that some confusion does actually occur both in official documents and provincial records. It would, therefore, be risky to dogmatise, but at the same time it may not be unimportant to note that in February 1592 Henslowe heads his accounts with the name of "my lord stranges mene", from which we may infer either that it was Strange's men alone who performed at his house, or else that the joint company normally passed under that name.

Some significance must, therefore, be allowed to the fact that it is of the Admiral's and not Strange's men that we find mention at the Theatre in November 1590 and May 1591.\* The mere name is

\* It appears that the company concerned is actually called the Admiral's in the documents, and this evidence is borne out by the allegation that in the course of the quarrel James Burbadge spoke contemptuously of the Lord Admiral. It should perhaps be mentioned that the supposition that the quarrel led to the company leaving the Theatre is an inference on Dr. Chambers' part, though a very reasonable one. There is no external evidence of the whereabouts of either company between May 1591 and February 1592.



not, as I have said, conclusive, but in the present instance it is supported by some collateral evidence. For the only players, apart from Richard Burbadge, actually named in the documents are John Alleyn and James Tunstall. There seems no doubt that both were members of the Admiral's company before its association with Strange's, and while we do not know that they were not also members of the combined company, there is no direct evidence that they were. If then by the Admiral's men of the documents we are to understand not the old Admiral's but the combined company (more correctly termed Strange's) it is certainly a curious coincidence that the only actors named should be among the few known to have belonged to the old Admiral's company, while of the very much larger number known to have joined in the amalgamation not one is mentioned.

It is now time to introduce the first Plot, that of the Second Part of *The Seven Deadly Sins*. The fact that the only three actors distinguished by the prefix "Mr." are also named in the licence of 1593 at once suggests that the play was acted either by the joint company or by one of its components. The appearance of Richard Burbadge has been supposed to indicate the Theatre as the place of performance, but in view of the close association of the two houses between 1585 and 1592, when the profits "were pooled under an agreement between Henry Lanman and the Burbadges" (ii. 402), I suppose that the Curtain is an alternative possibility, and in view of the close association of the companies that are supposed to have occupied these houses in 1590-1, it would hardly be surprising to find Richard acting at either as happened to be convenient.

In the Plot are preserved the names of twenty actors, while for two prominent parts, which cannot have been doubled, the performers are not recorded. The names are as follows: Mr. Pope, Mr. Phillipps, Mr. Brian, Richard Burbadge, Richard Cowley, John Duke, Robert Pallant, John Sincler, Thomas Goodale, William Sly, John Holland, Harry, Kitt, Vincent, Saunder, Nick, Robert, Ned, Will, and T. Belt, the last six being boys, and Vincent a musician. In the case of twelve out of the twenty the full name is recorded, and ten of these are otherwise known; the other eight, referred to by nick-names or incomplete names, can only be identified by more or less plausible conjecture. Now if the company concerned was the joint Admiral-Strange's men, it must have included Edward Alleyn. The absence of his name does not of itself raise any difficulty,

since two of the performers are unnamed. There are, however, certain other considerations that should give pause. We know that associated with Alleyn in 1593 were Thomas Downton and John Pyk, both of whom joined the Admiral's men the following year, but neither is traceable in the Plot. Possibly they only came in at a later date. We also know that associated presumably with Alleyn at the Theatre in 1590-1 were the old Admiral's men John Alleyn and James Tunstall, and neither can these be traced in the Plot. But if those actors who, whether at an earlier or later date, were most closely associated with Alleyn are absent, I cannot think it safe to assume that Alleyn himself took part in the performance. In that case it can hardly have been one given by the joint company. Indeed, no single actor named in the Plot can be shown to have had any connexion either with the earlier Admiral's men, of whom perhaps half a dozen can be more or less certainly identified,\* or with the later company of the same name, of the constitution of which we are of course particularly well informed. I find it, therefore, impossible to resist the inference that in the Plot we probably have a list, not of the joint company, but of the old Strange's men alone, a body of whose composition we have otherwise no knowledge whatever at the date in question.† Dr. Chambers speaks of the play as "performed by Strange's or the Admiral's or the two together about 1590-1" (ii. 198). For the reasons given I think the first of these alternatives the most likely: a joint performance cannot be disproved: one by the Admiral's is, I submit, clean contrary to the weight of evidence. A date *c.* 1590 seems reasonably certain, but I would suggest that, since it is impossible to show that there are any Admiral's elements in the Plot or any Strange's men concerned in the Burbadge disputes, the probability is that Strange's men performed *The Seven Deadly Sins* at the Curtain while the Admiral's men were acting separately at the Theatre, and that the regular amalgamation did not take place until the supposed migration to the Rose in 1591 or 1592.‡

I shall return to this Plot in considering the relation of Strange's

\* On the alleged connexion of Thomas Goodale with the Admiral's men, see below, pp. 268-9.

† Unless it be that George Ottewell was a member; but see p. 263.

‡ It might be suggested that the preservation of the plot at Dulwich points to its having belonged to the Admiral's men. No doubt there would have been plenty of opportunity for it to have found its way among Alleyn's own papers during the period of the amalgamation, but that it actually did so must, I admit, on my view have been an accident.

to the Chamberlain's men in 1594, but meanwhile I wish to introduce another, that, namely, of *The Dead Man's Fortune*. In regard to this the only two significant facts of which we can be certain are that it is of a more primitive type, and that Richard Burbadge played in it some part which we cannot confidently identify. This points to the Theatre (or alternatively, I submit, to the Curtain) and to a date about 1590. Dr. Chambers assigns it to the Admiral's men, and with this conclusion I am inclined to agree, though I do not see how he arrives at it on his interpretation of the general evidence.\* If the Plot is contemporary with that of *The Seven Deadly Sins*, its primitive nature makes it difficult to assign it to the same company; while the fact that apart from Burbadge none of the actors mentioned—Robert Lee, Darlowe, and Sam—are traceable in the very full cast of the other Plot corroborates this view. Since I believe that *The Seven Deadly Sins* was most likely Strange's, I agree that *The Dead Man's Fortune* was most likely the Admiral's, and this affords fresh evidence that the companies were distinct at the date in question.†

I now pass to the formation of the Lord Chamberlain's company in the spring of 1594, and I start with the assumption that the cast of *The Seven Deadly Sins* represents Strange's before any actors from the Admiral's had joined it. Apart from this document the only old Strange's men we are able to identify seem to be John Symons, who left the company in 1588, and George Ottewell or Attewell their payee in 1590-1,‡ of whom nothing more is heard till 1595, when he seems to have been with the Queen's men. Let us now compare the Plot with the licence. The latter was granted to Strange's company after the absorption of an element from the Admiral's consisting at least of Edward Alleyn. The six names

\* He writes (ii. 136): "A relic of this period [1590-1] may be presumed to exist in the 'plot' of *Dead Man's Fortune*, preserved with other plots belonging to the [Admiral's] company at Dulwich, in which Burbadge, doubtless Richard Burbadge, then still a boy, appeared. Certainly there is nothing to connect Burbadge with the company at any other date". But the Plot is not at Dulwich, and if it were (as it very likely once was), it would, on Dr. Chambers' own showing, be as likely to have come from Strange's as from the Admiral's men, since on his theory of a joint tenancy of the Theatre *The Dead Man's Fortune* stands on all fours with *The Seven Deadly Sins*, which is there.

† It is conceivable that one or both of the companies may have used either the Theatre or the Curtain as a summer playhouse before 1590. If so the primitive nature of the second Plot would tempt one to assign it to an earlier date, and the inference that it belonged to a different company from the first would be weakened. But such an early tenancy seems on the whole as unlikely.

‡ The payments were in respect of the joint performances, and it is, therefore, not absolutely certain to which company he belonged.

mentioned no doubt represent the leading members of the joint company, and it is natural to suppose that they were the sharers. In the Plot three actors are distinguished by the honorific "Mr.", and again it is natural to suppose that this distinguishes the sharers.\* Now the only names in the licence that appear in the Plot have the "Mr.", and the only names so marked in the Plot reappear in the licence. This confirms the view that in either case we have to do with sharers and sharers only, and permits certain plausible inferences. It is not easy to believe that the old Strange's company had only three sharers, and it is therefore probable that the two unnamed actors who appear in the Plot had that status likewise. There is no proof that these were Heminges and Kemp, who are named in the licence, but the supposition is a natural one. If so the sharers in the joint company consisted of the five sharers of the old Strange's men together with Alleyn, specifically distinguished as the Admiral's servant. This surely throws some light on the nature of the amalgamation, always supposing (as is I think probable) that the Admiral's contingent consisted of others besides Alleyn. What I imagine is not so much a fusion of the two companies as a temporary alliance between Strange's men and certain members of the disrupted Admiral's, whose leader Alleyn was given a seat on the board, so to speak, as a protection of their interests. This is not Dr. Chambers' view, but I cannot reconcile his view with the rather scanty facts at our disposal. "It is hardly possible", he writes (ii. 201), "to assume that the groups which segregated themselves from the Strange-Admiral's combination in 1594 bore any close correspondence to the respective contributions of Strange's and the Admiral's to that combination in 1589 or 1590". I submit that, on the contrary, all the evidence we possess does point in the direction of such a segregation of original elements. The case of Edward Alleyn is not, of course, in dispute. He was the leader of the old Admiral's men in 1589 and of the new Admiral's men in 1594, and maintained his status as the Lord Admiral's servant throughout. But it cannot be shown that a single member of the old Admiral's company, or a single actor personally associated with Alleyn, remained

\* Dr. Chambers protests privately that the players both of the plot and the licence may have owed their distinction not to the fact that they were sharers, but to that of their being the personal servants of their Lord. But as he admits that these "servants", being officially the "company", would normally be the sharers, the point does not affect the present argument, though it may become relevant later on.

with Strange's (then Derby's) men after Alleyn's departure. Of the old Admiral's men John Alleyn, who was at the Theatre in 1590-1, appears to have retired from the stage before 1594. His fellow at the Theatre, James Tunstall,\* was a member of the later Admiral's. So was Richard Jones, but as he had been abroad in the interval he is less likely to have taken part in the amalgamation. We ought perhaps to add Edward Brown, who, as a Worcester's man in 1583, may have belonged to the old Admiral's, and was with the later Admiral's company in 1599 or 1600. Robert Lee, of the old Admiral's Plot, was not improbably with the joint company in 1593. He is next heard of with Queen Anne's men in 1604, but there is no reason to suppose that he may not have joined the later Admiral's ten years earlier, though no evidence that he did. Of Darlowe and Sam in the same Plot nothing further is heard. None of these can be proved to have been members of the joint company (though it is natural to suppose that some of them followed their leader throughout), but this is no more than to say that Edward Alleyn himself is the only known contribution of the Admiral's to the so-called amalgamation. Again, Alleyn's private correspondence only shows two members of the joint company personally connected with him, Downton and Pyk, and both were later members of the Admiral's company. On the other hand, if I am right in regarding the Plot of *The Seven Deadly Sins* as affording a pure Strange's cast, there can be no question of the close correspondence of the old Strange's both with the company of 1593 and with the later Chamberlain's men, of which more in a moment. Thus there is no evidence of any old Admiral's man passing later to the Chamberlain's company, or of any old Strange's man passing to the Admiral's; † *per contra* several members of the old Admiral's are also found among the later Admiral's men, and of these Alleyn at least passed through the joint company, while a considerable

\* Dr. Chambers remarks (ii. 138) that Tunstall is not mentioned among "the members of the 1592-3 Strange's and Admiral's company". But his presence at the Theatre in 1590-1 would, on Dr. Chambers' view, though not on mine, make him a member of the joint company.

† There is one possible exception to this statement, though we cannot give his name. The book-keeper who wrote the Plot of *The Seven Deadly Sins* for Strange's men c. 1590, and superintended the revision of *Sir Thomas More* perhaps for the same company c. 1593-4, also wrote a Plot (now fragmentary) for the Admiral's men in 1597-8, but at what date he joined the latter company is uncertain. His work for it is after the amalgamation with Pembroke's, and as Pembroke's very likely included seceders from the Chamberlain's, he may have been with the latter company from 1594 to 1596.



number of actors are common to the old Strange's and the Chamberlain's men, and of these four are known to have passed through the joint company. If this is not evidence (so far as it goes) of segregation I know not what is.

Moreover, it receives some confirmation from a consideration of dates. Strange's men (presumably still the joint company) became Derby's on the succession of their patron to the peerage on 25 September 1593. The Earl of Derby died on 16 April 1594, and a company appeared under the Countess's name on 16 May. But the new Admiral's men had begun acting in London two days previously. It is clear, therefore, that Alleyn and any followers he may have had separated themselves from the joint body at a date anterior to the changes (whatever they may have been) which took place in it shortly afterwards.

All this clearly has some bearing upon, though it is distinct from, the problem of the continuity of Strange's (Derby's) and the Chamberlain's company. Dr. Chambers has the following very cautious statement on this point. "It is not, I think, quite accurate to treat this transaction as a mere continuance of Lord Derby's men under the style of Lord Chamberlain's, entailing no reconstruction other than a change of patron following upon Lord Derby's death on 16 April 1594. On the one hand, a Derby's company continued in existence, and is traceable under the sixth earl from 1594 to 1617. On the other hand, while we do not know what business reconstruction there may have been, a very fundamental change is involved in the replacement of Alleyn as principal actor by Richard Burbadge, who is not at all likely to have played with Strange's men after the break between the Admiral's and his father at the Theatre in 1591" (ii. 198). It is hard to dispute so moderate a statement, but there are nevertheless certain considerations which should, I think, be weighed before Dr. Chambers' view is finally accepted.

I have just shown that Alleyn seems to have separated himself from the company before the possible date of transference. As to Burbadge, it is mainly Dr. Chambers' insistence on the identity of the Admiral's and Strange's men that raises a presumption against his presence in the joint company. And in any case, considering the difficulties that beset actors in time of plague, it would surely have been an exaggeration of piety that should have debarred young Richard in 1593 from travelling with a company some members of



which had quarrelled with his father two years before. There is, indeed, no trace of his presence in that company; but neither is there in the Chamberlain's before March 1595, so that, if he never belonged to the 1593 amalgamation, it is impossible to be certain that he was an original member of the Chamberlain's company.

In my view what remained of the joint company after Alleyn's departure represented (no doubt with some insignificant loss and gain) the original Strange's men as recorded in the Plot of *The Seven Deadly Sins*. Compare the cast of the Plot with what we know of the Chamberlain's men. There are in the Plot twelve actors fully named. Of two of these, John Holland and a boy called T. Belt, nothing further is known, nor can Thomas Goodale be certainly connected with any later company. Robert Pallant was with Worcester's in 1602, but there is nothing unlikely in the assumption that he was with the Chamberlain's eight years before. There remain eight, and these are all known to have been Chamberlain's men, possibly from 1594 onwards. We should perhaps add Heminges and Kemp on the assumption that they were the two unnamed actors of the Plot. With the exception of Burbadge all these probably held together continuously from 1590 to 1594. Not a single actor in the Plot can be traced with any company but the Chamberlain's between its formation and the end of the century. Again, all the actors of the 1593 licence, with the exception of Alleyn, are assumed to have become leaders of the Chamberlain's men in 1594; while the only other member of the joint company apart from Alleyn's intimates, Richard Cowley, also became a Chamberlain's man. Approaching the question from the opposite direction, I note that Dr. Chambers conjectures that there were ten original sharers in the Chamberlain's company (ii. 199<sup>1</sup>). Of these six were certainly, and two others (Sly and Condell) very probably, members of the 1593 troop; and if it is unlikely (though hardly impossible) that the remaining pair (Burbadge and Shakespeare) were also members, both were (according to Dr. Chambers) old associates of their later fellows. Thus in personnel at least the continuity seems to have been pretty complete; and I think that there is a good deal to be said for the view that on Derby's death on 16 April 1594, just at the moment when theatrical prospects were beginning to brighten, Alleyn, together with such of the old Admiral's men as had remained with him and two or three later comers particularly attached to him like his apprentice Pyk, left the joint company and sought his fortunes

in London, where he established himself on 14 May; that the rest of the company, representing substantially the old Strange's men, continued at least till 16 May under the protection of the widow of their late patron,\* and then transferred themselves in a body to the service of the Lord Chamberlain, arriving in London in the first days of June; and that the later Derby's men, who are first heard of on 15 September at Norwich, were some quite distinct and purely provincial company that had sought the protection of the new Earl. On this view the continuity of Strange's with the Chamberlain's men would be just as real as that of the latter with the King's men, a transfer marked, it will be remembered, by the rather mysterious appearance of Lawrence Fletcher as the apparent leader of the new company. †

\* On the assumption of the continuity of the earlier and later Derby's men, it would be possible to argue that both the Admiral's and Chamberlain's had branched off before the date of this performance. But Dr. Chambers does not, I understand, take this view, since it is only by excluding this possibility that he is justified in asserting (ii. 198<sup>1</sup>) that one Rafe Raye, who was "my lord chamberlenes" man on 13 May 1594, held that position "before the company was in existence at all".

† As regards the relations of the Admiral's, Strange's, and the Chamberlain's men, Dr. Chambers' theory may be said to be one of fusion and division, mine one of association and segregation.

In dealing with the connexion of Strange's and the Chamberlain's men I have avoided laying stress on the possibility of tracing the minor actors in the Plot. Dr. Chambers speaks of certain "rather hazardous identifications" having been "attempted by Greg and Fleay", adding, "The object is, of course, to establish the connexion between Strange's and the Chamberlain's men" (ii. 125<sup>2</sup>). The imputation is unreasonable, since such sort of connexion as can be established at all is amply proved by the unquestioned correspondence of personnel. If any attempt be made to identify the actors whose full names are not preserved, it is in the Chamberlain's company alone that it is legitimate to seek them. In point of fact, Dr. Chambers himself accepts the identification of "Ro. Go." with Robert Gough as probable. And I do not think that the occurrence of the names (two of these unusual ones) Harry, Kit, Saunder, and Nick on the one hand, and Henry Condell, Christopher Beeston, Alexander Cooke, and Nicholas Tooley on the other, is likely to be accidental, though I do not press the point. I am sure that nothing was further from Dr. Chambers' intention than to misrepresent the position of those from whom he differs, but that does not make his remarks in this instance the less misleading.

One problem upon which the history of these companies has a bearing is the authorship of the play of *Sir Thomas More*. The only actor mentioned in the manuscript is Thomas Goodale, and the occurrence of his name has been used to connect the play with either Strange's or the Chamberlain's men, and has thereby, no doubt, favoured the inclination of some critics to find in it the hand of Shakespeare. On Dr. Chambers' view the appearance of Goodale's name in the Plot of *The Seven Deadly Sins* would most likely imply membership of the amalgamated company, and if he was still acting in 1594 the claims of the Chamberlain's, the Admiral's, and the later Derby's men to his services would be about equal. On mine he would have belonged to the old Strange's company, and there would be a later presumption in favour of the Chamberlain's. But I, of course, admit the possibility that he may have transferred his services to the Admiral's

*The Seven Deadly Sins* and *The Dead Man's Fortune* are the only two extant Plots that belong to an early date or of which the provenance is in any way doubtful. They presumably came into or remained in Alleyn's hands on his leaving the joint company and forming the later Admiral's in the spring of 1594. The other five Plots of which we have knowledge were clearly all produced for this new company between the years 1597 and 1602 inclusive. Three give no trouble to the historian. That of *Frederick and Basilea* was for a play first performed on 3 June 1597, and there is every reason to suppose that it was prepared for that occasion. Another, now fragmentary, belonged to some play on the siege of Troy, which may, I think, be confidently identified with the *Troilus and Cressida* on which Chettle and Dekker were engaged in April 1599. If so, it probably belongs to the following month, a date that agrees satisfactorily with the internal indications. A third is that of the First Part of *Tamar Cam*, an old play which had belonged to Strange's (joint) company in 1592, and was revived in revised form by the Admiral's in 1596. But the Plot cannot, on internal grounds, be as early as this, and since the company bought the "booke" from Alleyn on 2 October 1602, it is natural to assume that the Plot was prepared for a revival about that date, which satisfies the requirements of the cast. The two remaining Plots are both the subject of more or less serious dispute.

Of one no more than a small fragment now remains, the mutilated heading to which may be plausibly reconstructed as "The plott of the second part of fortunes tennis". It is admitted that this points to some connexion with a play mentioned by Henslowe on 6 September 1600, when he advanced 20s. to the company "to paye vnto

(or some other) company, and I should not raise the question here but for one curious argument of Dr. Chambers'. He writes (ii. 319): "If he is the Thomas Goodale, mercer, who entered with John Alleyn and Robert Lee into a bond to Edward Alleyn on 18 May 1593, he was not improbably connected with the Admiral's" in or before 1590. In the document in question John Allein, innholder, Thomas Goodale, mercer, and Robert Lee, gentleman, undertake to discharge a debt of £19 to John Allen, gentleman [not Edward Alleyn]. I agree that John Alleyn and Robert Lee were Admiral's men in 1590 (though Dr. Chambers has no business to assume it), but I believe them both to have followed Edward Alleyn into the so-called amalgamation, and the bond is evidence of their association with Goodale at its own date and not earlier. It affords, therefore, no presumption whatever that Goodale was with the Admiral's rather than Strange's men in 1590, and the occurrence of his name in *Sir Thomas More* must, for what it is worth, be allowed to connect that play with Strange's men (either the pure or the joint variety) if it is earlier than the spring of 1594, and if later to afford some slight preference for the Chamberlain's men as its owners.

Thomas deckers for his boocke called the fortewn tenes ". Since at this date the company was preparing to move into the Fortune theatre, I once hazarded the guess that " there may quite possibly be some allusion to the name of their new house " (*Diary*, ii. 215). Dr. Chambers has taken up this conjecture and writes of Dekker's piece : " Only £1 was paid for 1 *Fortune's Tennis*, but the existence of a ' plot ' for 2 *Fortune's Tennis* suggests that it must have been completed. Probably it was a short topical overture designed to celebrate the opening of the Fortune " (ii. 178) ; while of the Plot he says : " This is difficult to date, but it must be later than Dekker's 1 *Fortune's Tennis* of September 1600, and may not improbably be [for] Munday's *Set at Tennis* of December 1602 " (ii. 177, cf. iv. 14) ; and he elsewhere suspects " that Munday's *Set at Tennis* is the 2 *Fortune's Tennis* of which a ' plot ' survives. The payment, of only £3, was ' in full ', and it may, like 1 *Fortune's Tennis*, have been a short piece of some exceptional character, motivated by the name of the theatre at which it was presented " (ii. 180).

As a matter of fact, both Dr. Chambers and I have been on the wrong tack, for the Plot cannot possibly be as late as 1600, let alone 1602. In this, namely, as in the Plot of *Frederick and Basilea* of June 1597, Sam and Charles (that is Rowley and Massey) appear without the prefix " Mr. ", by which they are already distinguished in that of *Troilus and Cressida* in May 1599. Whatever be the precise meaning of this honorific, a point to which I shall return, we are clearly not at liberty to assume that it was arbitrarily bestowed or withheld, and we are, I consider, bound to place the Plot earlier than that of *Troilus and Cressida*. The two actors in question were most likely entitled to the distinction by November (possibly by March) 1598, and this is the latest year to which the Plot can reasonably be assigned. On the other hand, the presence of George, Tailor, and Cartwright, none of whom appear in *Frederick and Basilea*, almost certainly places it after the reconstruction of the company in October 1597. Since there is no trace of any such play either in the performance lists of the Admiral's men down to the summer of 1597, or among the new plays purchased in 1597-8, I would now suggest that they acquired a two-part piece called *Fortune's Tennis* from the short-lived Pembroke's company in October 1597, that they revived at least the second part of it in the course of the next twelve months, and that Dekker's " boocke called

the fortewn tenes", for which he was paid 20s. in 1600, was merely a fusion of the two parts into a single play.\*

Before proceeding something must be said as to the significance of the title "Mr." in the Plots. It is natural to suppose that the prefix designates a sharer in the company, and we have already seen that the assumption works well in the case of *The Seven Deadly Sins*. It leads, however, to some trouble over the date of the remaining Plot, that of *The Battle of Alcazar*, and Dr. Chambers, while admitting it to be "in accordance with the ordinary use of the Dulwich documents", is inclined to reject it in particular cases, I think unjustly. The ground of our knowledge of the sharers in the later Admiral's men is certain lists in Henslowe's accounts, mostly signatures appended in acknowledgment of the company's debt. We cannot be certain that these lists are in every case comprehensive—indeed we know that from one two names were accidentally omitted—though they are probably in general reliable, and are obviously exclusive. The dates of the lists that here concern us are 11 October 1597, 8–13 March 1598, 10 July 1600, and 7–23 February 1602. There are also a number of very interesting contracts between Henslowe and various actors, which have a bearing on the question and require a word of explanation. In February 1597 the affairs of the company were considerably upset by the defection of two leading members to join in the formation of a new troop under the patronage of the Earl of Pembroke. The venture ended in disaster, and the following summer the prodigals returned to the fold bringing several of their late fellows with them. Henslowe took the opportunity of guarding against a repetition of the incident by requiring these and others to sign contracts to continue with the company for a specified term. Twelve actors in all are concerned, but their engagements are not all of the same nature. Two (Hearne and Kendall) specify wages and certainly relate to hired men; one with a clown (Helle) is otherwise abnormal, and one is for the purchase of an apprentice (Bristow); in six out of the remaining

\* If, as is not unlikely, the manuscript was inscribed, "The Booke of the Whole of Fortunes Tennis", it would account for the anomalous use of the article in Henslowe's entry. When, a few months earlier, Dekker recast the old two-part play of *Fortunatus* into a single piece, this is called by Henslowe, "the wholle history of fortunatus". If my theory is correct we should expect to find the old piece mentioned among "such bookes as belong to the Stocke" in the company's inventory of March 1598. It may be there under another title, but in any case the list is demonstrably incomplete. Dr. Chambers conjectures that the *Dido and Aeneas* produced by the Admiral's men on 8 January 1598 "was taken over from Pembroke's repertory" (iii. 374), though it is not in the inventory.



eight cases the actors concerned are known to have been sharers, and one would therefore naturally suppose that the remaining pair were sharers likewise, though their absence from Henslowe's lists is of course a serious obstacle. One of these is Thomas Heywood, of whom we have no other knowledge whether as an actor or sharer in the company; the other is Richard Alleyn, of whom we shall hear a good deal more shortly. I should add that the contracts with four of the sharers (Jones, Shaa, Birde, Downton), all from Pembroke's, are dated before the resumption of performances in October 1597, while the other four are later (R. Alleyn and Heywood, 25 March 1598; Rowley and Massey, 16 November 1598). Since these four are definitely known not to have been sharers in October 1597, the most natural assumption is that their contracts with Henslowe mark the dates at which they acquired an interest in the company.\*

We can now attack the last of our problems, the date of the Plot of *The Battle of Alcazar*. Dr. Chambers argues convincingly that the Plot must be after 18 December 1597, when Henslowe "bought" his boy Bristow, who is almost certainly the James of the Plot, and before a date early in February 1602, when Jones and Shaa, who took parts, retired from the company. But he has overlooked the fact that Richard Alleyn, who also acted in the play, died on 18 November 1601 (ii. 299).† Another actor was Edward Alleyn, who is said by Henslowe to have "left playing" before 29 December 1597. Dr. Chambers regards this retirement of Alleyn, for which there is a good deal of incidental evidence, as continuous and absolute till the opening of the Fortune towards the end of 1600, a view that seems to me to strain the argument. Alleyn is known to have been in London in the winter of 1598-9, while in that of 1599-1600 the project of his new playhouse presumably again necessitated his presence. Although he was no longer a regular member of the company, I see no reason to suppose that he may not have occasionally acted with it during these years; but he probably avoided doing so towards the end, since he used his late

\* I have considered the matter more fully in *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements*. The earlier discussion in my edition of Henslowe's Diary is certainly incorrect, as Dr. Chambers shows, but on the other hand I cannot regard his treatment of the evidence as other than high-handed. He assumes that in some instances the mention of wages has been accidentally omitted.

† I presume that this was a late discovery of Dr. Chambers', the importance of which he failed to grasp, since it disposes of the date 1602, which he usually assigns to the Plot, and of that of September 1602, which he elsewhere (ii. 176) gives as that of Alleyn's death.



"discontinuance" as a plea for the licence of his new enterprise. Of course, if there were no other evidence available, one would avoid assigning the Plot to this particular period, but that I submit is far from being the case.

There are two actors in *The Battle of Alcazar* distinguished by the honorific "Mr." who cannot be traced in Henslowe's lists of sharers. Unless, therefore, we are prepared to argue that the lists are in these instances incomplete—which would, I conceive, be somewhat arbitrary—we must either abandon the otherwise satisfactory assumption that "Mr." indicates a sharer, or conclude that these two actors began and terminated their sharership between the dates of two of Henslowe's lists, say between those of March 1598 and July 1600, or between those of July 1600 and February 1602. Now, the two actors in question are Richard Alleyn and Thomas Hunt. Of the latter we know nothing relevant except that he acted as plain Thomas Hunt in *Frederick and Basilea* (1597) and as Mr. Hunt in *Troilus and Cressida* (1599).<sup>\*</sup> But it is otherwise with Richard Alleyn. He too acted as plain R. Alleyn in *Frederick and Basilea*, but on 25 March 1598 he bound himself to Henslowe for the term of two years. This, we have seen, is *prima facie* evidence that he was a sharer, and it will be observed that the contract was shortly after the date of the sharer-list of 8–13 March 1598, and that the term would be up some months before the next list of July 1600. But this is not all. Henslowe, in entering disbursements for the company, frequently records the name of the person authorising the payment on their behalf. These persons are naturally the sharers who subsequently acknowledge the joint debt. Now, Richard Alleyn twice appears in the Diary as authorising payments in this manner, first on 17 January 1599 (jointly with Birde), and again on 6 May 1600 (alone). The second instance is some weeks after the expiration of his contract, but still a couple of months before the next list of sharers. In face of these three independent and mutually corroborative pieces of evidence I am quite unable to resist the conclusion that Richard Alleyn was for a time a sharer in the Admiral's company.†

<sup>\*</sup> Dr. Chambers gives the name in *Troilus and Cressida* as "Thomas Hunt" (ii. 158), but this is a mistake.

† Of course I consider Thomas Hunt, who like Richard Alleyn is distinguished as "Mr." in the Plot of *The Battle of Alcazar*, and Thomas Heywood, who like him entered into a two-years' contract on 25 March 1598, to have had the same history. Dr. Chambers categorically denies that Richard Alleyn and Hunt were sharers, and asserts that their "long service had apparently earned them the dignity of the 'Mr.'" (ii. 175). Their "long service", however, is pure assumption on

We are therefore, I conceive, obliged to date the *Alcazar* Plot between March 1598 and July 1600. But since in the case of Richard Alleyn his contract with Henslowe pretty clearly marks the date of his becoming a sharer, the presumption is that the same is true of Rowley and Massey, and this would place the Plot after 16 November 1598.\* Since Edward Alleyn, if he acted at all, is more likely to have done so in the winter than the summer, which we know he sometimes spent in the country, and since he is more likely to have done so in 1598-9 than in 1599-1600, it is to the former winter that I am inclined to assign the Plot. This would place it within a few months of that of *Troilus and Cressida*, which, it may be remarked, was drawn up by the same hand.†

It will be seen that there are a number of points at which the Plots throw light upon the details of Elizabethan stage history, and if I have succeeded in carrying my readers with me in the foregoing pages, it will be admitted that these documents have not yet been made to yield all the evidence of which they are capable.

Dr. Chambers' part. I regard Richard Alleyn's sharership as sufficiently proved even if Dr. Chambers should be right in his conjecture that "Mr." indicates primarily a personal relation to the "lord" and only contingently financial sharing in the company. The only other hint of a non-sharer authorising payments is the occasional appearance of the name "W<sup>m</sup> Jube", and the evidence suggests that this is a slip for "mr" or Edward Juby.

\* The names of Rowley and Massey, whose joint contract is dated 16 November 1598, appear in the list of sharers belonging to the previous March. They occur, however, in such a way as to suggest that they may have been added later. It is significant that Rowley was one of the most frequent representatives of the company in authorising payments on behalf of his fellows, his name occurring forty-two times in all, but it does so first on 12 December 1598.

† It is very reluctantly that I differ from Dr. Chambers on this matter of the date of *Alcazar*, but the only way in which my view of the evidence respecting Richard Alleyn could be reconciled with his view of the evidence respecting Edward Alleyn, would be by assuming Henslowe's list of July 1600 to be incomplete, and this, as I have already said, would appear too arbitrary a proceeding. In discussing the question in *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements*, I argued that the Plot must be before March 1599, on the ground that properties belonging to it are included in an inventory of the company dated 10 March 1598, which I took to be 1598/9. But Dr. Chambers has shown the true date to be 1597/8 on conclusive evidence which I strangely overlooked. This I feel sure is too early a date for the Plot. The presence of properties in the inventory would therefore imply either that *Alcazar* was identical with some earlier piece, such as *Muly Mollocco* (1592) or *Mahomet* (1594-5), which I find it very difficult to believe, or that there had been an earlier revival in the autumn of 1597, which seems equally unlikely. I am more inclined now to reject the appearance of properties for *Alcazar* in the inventory altogether. The crucial entry is that of "the moor's limbs", which at first sight seems conclusive in spite of the fact that it is the body rather than the limbs that the extant text requires. But I notice that in 1560 the Revels Office had "legges ffeete Armes and hands" of moors that were nothing but black velvet tights (Feuillerat, *Revels under Elizabeth*, 1908, p. 24). If the moor's limbs in the inventory were of the same nature, they may have been used for many different plays and it is unnecessary to connect them with *The Battle of Alcazar*.

## NICHOLAS UDALL AND THOMAS WILSON

BY A. W. REED

THE Winchester School Register describes Nicholas Udall on his admission in 1517 as "Owdall of the parish of St. Cross, Southampton, 12 years old at Xmas 1516." He was admitted at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in June 1520, "aged 14 or more." When he made his depositions as a witness in the trial of Stephen Gardiner on Thursday, December 15, 1550, he described himself as forty-four years of age or thereabouts. We are probably safe in stating that Udall was born *c.* 1505.\* In 1526 he was involved with others of Lutheran tendencies in sheltering Garrett, a distributor of heretical books,† but, escaping conviction, he is described (1526-28) as a lecturer. On February 28, 1532-3, he dedicated his *Floures for Latin Speaking* "to my most sweet flock of pupils," "from the monastery of monks of the order of Augustine," his pupils being almost certainly of St. Anthony's School, where Sir Thomas More had his earlier schooling, in Threadneedle Street, near the house of the Austin Friars. There are complimentary verses prefaced by his Oxford friends, Edmund Jonson, headmaster of St. Antony's, and John Leland. Three months later he collaborated with Leland in composing ditties in Latin and English for the London pageants at the coronation of Anne Boleyn on May 31, 1533. He became headmaster of Eton in 1534, and was paid £5 by Cromwell on February 2, 1537-8, for a play by his boys.

In 1541 he was summoned before the Privy Council on a charge of complicity in the theft and sale of silver images and plate belonging to Eton, along with a London goldsmith and two of his scholars—one of them a relative of a member of the Privy Council. The result was that he confessed a more serious crime and was dismissed.‡ On the question of Udall's guilt there has been division of opinion;

\* A. F. Leach (*Ency. Brit.*), Wood (*Athenæ*), Foxe (1838), Ed. Cattley, VI. 157.

† Foxe, V. 423.

‡ Acts of the Privy Council, 14 Mar., 32 Hen. VIII. (1540-1).

but it is certain that he left Eton in debt, and that he was living a life that he was unable to defend. Equally, there is no doubt that he had lost neither the confidence of his friends nor ultimately that of the Privy Council!

A reference in some verses by Leland suggests that he now visited the North, while the Border was disturbed. This was probably with his patron, Robert Aldridge, Provost of Eton and Bishop of Carlisle, shortly before the Battle of Solway Moss in 1542. We may note that Leland addresses him as *tam niveum mihi sodalem* and depleos his exile,

Translatum ad rigidos quidem Brigantes  
Quo vix crediderim migrasse Musas  
Nam Mavors ibi regnat ac cruentos  
Exercet gladios.

In 1542 he published a translation of the *Apophthegms* of Erasmus. Then, under the patronage of Katherine Parr, he collaborated in translating Erasmus' *Paraphrase*. In this he interested Princess Mary, who undertook part of St. John's Gospel; and being thus fully occupied he resigned in 1544 a small living he had held at Braintree. Thus he was engaged until the close of Henry's reign in January 1546-7. Under Edward VI. he was much employed and well rewarded by the Privy Council. He reported officially Gardiner's sermon (preached before the young king) on June 29, 1548.\* He was appointed "schoolmaster" to the unfortunate Edward Courtenay, in the Tower, and drew his first quarter's salary, £3 6s. 8d., in June 1549.† In the same year he was employed by the Privy Council to draw up an elaborate "Answer to the Articles of the Commoners of Devonshire and Cornwall." On December 15, 1550, he was a witness in the examination that preceded Stephen Gardiner's deprivation from Winchester. Already in the same year, he had been granted an exclusive patent for the printing and publication of two works on the Eucharist translated by him from Peter Martyr, for the publishing and printing of the Bible in English, and for other "good books" which he intended to print and set forth "for the better instruction of the youth of our realm in the grammar schools and otherwise."‡ He was presented in November 1551 to a Prebend of Windsor,§ whence, in September 1552, he dated his preface to Gemini's *Anatomic*. His last appointment under

\* Foxe, VI. 157.

† Pat. Rolls, 4 Ed. VI., Pt. V.

‡ P.R.O. Exchequer a/cs., 426/6.

§ Pat. Rolls, 5 Ed. VI., Pt. II.

Edward VI. was to the living of Calthorpe, in the Isle of Wight, in March 1553.\* Four months later Edward VI. died, and Udall entered upon a period of Court favour under Mary, with whom he had been associated, as we have seen, in translating Erasmus. The fact that he was "schoolmaster" at the Tower to Edward Courtenay may have enabled him to be of service to Gardiner, Courtenay's fellow-prisoner.

Both were released on Mary's accession, Courtenay to become a favourite and Gardiner to resume his see and become Lord Chancellor. When Gardiner died two years later, in 1555, he left 40 marks to Udall, whom he described as his schoolmaster. We may assume that this office attached him to the chapel and household of the episcopal palace of Winchester in Southwark, in the Clink or Bankside, and that Udall held it during the short period of Gardiner's restoration, from August 1553 to November 1555.

A month after Gardiner's death, Udall was appointed headmaster of Westminster, where he died a year later, and was buried in St. Margaret's on December 23, 1556. It remains to be noted that he had been granted by warrant from the Queen unusual privileges as a Court dramatist and producer, and that during the last three and a half years of his life, which fell in Mary's reign, he was active and in favour at Court.

## II.

It is clear from what has been said of Udall's activities after his dismissal in disgrace, in 1541, from Eton, that his friends stood by him. This is apparent, not only in the verses of Leland and the confidence of his patroness, Katherine Parr and her protégé, Princess Mary, but also in the actions of his former pupil, Thomas Wilson, author of the *Arte of Logique* and the *Arte of Rhetorique*. Wilson was at Eton for the greater part of the time of Udall's headmastership, and left for King's College, Cambridge, in the year of Udall's dismissal. As he comes prominently into this story, something may be said of him conveniently now.

He took his first degree in 1546, and coming under the influence of Sir John Cheke and Sir Thomas Smith, also became intimate with Ascham. His Lincolnshire neighbours, the Willoughbys, including the Duchess of Suffolk, Katherine Willoughby, as well as Sir Edward

\* Pat. Rolls, 7 Ed. VI., Pt. III.

Dymock and Cecil, furthered his advance. The Duchess appointed him tutor to her sons, Henry and Charles, in 1546. He was tutor also to Charles Willoughby, son of the Lord Deputy of Calais. The tragic death of the young Duke of Suffolk and his brother on July 16, 1551, within half an hour of one another, adds a note of poignant interest to the story we have to relate. Wilson collaborated with another Etonian friend, Haddon, in commemorating this tragedy in the *Vita et obitus duorum fratrum Suffolciensium*.

It was Haddon who suggested to Wilson that he should compile a treatise on logic in English. This—the *Arte of Logique*—appeared in 1551. A second edition followed in 1552. The third edition, dated *mense Januariae* 1553, appeared at the same time as the first edition of the *Arte of Rhetorique*, which is similarly dated. The third edition of the *Arte of Logique*, however, differs in one important respect from the earlier editions. Under the term “ambiguïtie” appears “an example of such doubtful writing which by reason of pointing may have double sense and contrary meaning *taken out of an interlude made by Nicholas Udall*.” The “example” consists of the letters in *Roister Doister*, in both forms, beginning:

Sweet mestresse, where as I love you nothing at all,  
Regarding your substance and richness chiefe of all.

Had this addition not been made to Wilson's third edition in January 1553-4, *Roister Doister* would have remained an anonymous play. No copy of it was known until an old Etonian, the Rev. Dr. Thomas Briggs, found in 1818, and presented to the library of Eton, the unique copy treasured there. It has no title-page, however, although probably it is the edition entered as “play intituled *Rauf Ruyster Duster*” to Thomas Hacket in 1566. Dr. Briggs was not aware either that Udall was its author or that he had been headmaster of Eton, and in making to his old school this curiously appropriate gift, he was not influenced by any thoughts of Udall.

### III.

We now come to a curious story which shows Wilson and Udall associated between 1551 and 1553, Udall as a defendant, and Wilson as a witness on his behalf, in a Chancery suit, Wilson making his depositions just a year before the passage from *Roister Doister* first appeared in his *Art of Logique*. Udall's Bill of Complaint was



addressed to Goodrich of Ely, Chancellor in 1552-3.\* In effect it amounts to this. In May 1551, one John Grenberye, in whose house we learn later that Udall had a chamber, being greatly in debt besought Udall to secure for him letters of recommendation to Lord Willoughby, Deputy of Calais, for the post of vitualler to the garrison at Calais. These letters—through Thomas Wilson's influence—Udall obtained, and, armed with them, accompanied Grenberye to Calais, where Lord Willoughby issued a warrant under his "seal and armys of Calice," directed to Lord Chancellor Rich for the issue of letters of protection, without which Grenberye could not hold his post overseas. Udall for these offices received from Grenberye and his backer, Humphry Welles, Fishmonger, £10, but entered into a bond to them to return £5 if by August 1, 1551, the Lord Chancellor had not granted the letters of protection. The Lord Chancellor refused to ratify Lord Willoughby's warrant, and Udall refusing to refund the £5 was arrested by the Sheriff's officers. His appeal in Chancery was to stop the proceedings at the Guildhall, on a counter-claim against Grenberye, who, he alleged, owed him 20 marks. This sum was made up of the expenses of the journey to Calais, which Grenberye was to have paid but which Udall had borne, and two earlier loans of £5 10s.; one of them for the purchase for "four skore and odd dozens of quayles." Moreover, not only had the money for the "quayles" been withheld, but the "moitie" also of the "gaines" therefrom. Further, he urged that "where yor orator for quyetnes and in eschewing the troublesomnes of going to lawe and expence of money, offered to allowe out of the same some (20 marks, or £13 6s. 8d.) to the said Grenberie £5, (he) paying to your orator the rest, though the said Grenberie sundry tymes in wordes condescended and agreed," yet he had commenced an action before the Sheriffs of London and caused him to be arrested. He prays that a writ of certiorari be directed to the Sheriffs commanding them "to certify the cause of his arrest," and a writ of subpœna be directed to Grenberie commanding him to appear before the Court of Chancery. In this Udall succeeded, and we are fortunate enough to have in the *Town Depositions* † the evidence given by Thomas Wilson and others. Wilson's depositions, made on 29 Jan. 1552-3, we give verbatim.

\* Early Chancery Proceedings, 1319.

† P.R.O. *Town Depositions*, C, 24, 30.

*Ex parte Nich<sup>o</sup> Uvedale contra Johannem Greneb(er)y per—Skeynner  
testes examinantem.*

Thomas Wilson of Wasshyngboroughe in the Countie of Lyncoln. Gent of the age of XXIX yeres sworne and examinyd the XXIXth Januarie in the seventh yere of the reign of kyng Edward the VIth seyeth that he was servant and scolem<sup>r</sup> to the lorde Charles brother to the dukes Grace of Suffolk that last dyed at the tyme of his decesse and 5 yeres before/ by reason whereof this deponent at the mediacion and request of the said Nicholas Uvedale about Maye or June last past was towre yeres dyd obteyn certain lettres from the duchess grace of Suffolk and from the said lord Charles her son and from Mr. Charles Willoughby son and heire apparaunt to the Lord Willoughby then lord deputie of Calice in the favour of the said John Grenebery directyd to the said lord Willoughby that the same Grenebery myght be admytted a victeller of Calyce aforesaid and to have a bill of protecyon signyd and sealyd with his hand and seale for certain yeres/ Whereupon this deponent dyd send and delyver to the same messenger that came from Grenebery aforesaid being his especiall trustie ffrend (as this deponent doth suppose) all the same lettres signyd and sealyd by the said duchess lord Charles and Mr. Charles Willoughby together with the deponentes owne lettres to the said lord deputie of Calyce aforesaid who for teachyng of his said son had promysyd to gratify this deponent or any ffrend of his in his reasonable suyt/ whych said lettres were obteyned by this deponent in the respect and at the only request of the said Uvedale and at no mannys els/ and further seyeth that the said lorde Willoughby at his next return into England dyd shewe and declare unto this deponent besydes his wrytting to the said duchess and lord Charles that he had accomplyshed the said request at the comyng of the said Uvedale to Calyce aforesaid and had made out his warrant of protecion for the said Grenebery for one yere/ and seyed that he was sory that he could grant hym for no moo years/ And more he cannot depose.

*Thomas Wilson.*

The evidence of the other witnesses may be briefly summarised. *Richard Garth of Lincoln's Inn* tells how, at the request of his friend Humphrey Welles, he presented Grenebery's suit and warrant before the Lord Chancellor at his house at St. Bartholomew's, Smithfield, and was refused the letters of protection. He added that Udall sought to secure the warrant, presumably in order that he might use his influence in securing the grant.

*Humphrey Welles*, of St. Dunstan's in the East, Citizen and Fishmonger, who had provided the £10 for the transaction, and was behind Grenebery, denied (1) that he had ever said that Udall had shewn himself "a faithful and upright friend," (2) that Udall had ever asked him to get him the warrant in order that he himself might

secure the grant, (3) that he and Grenebery had kept the warrant deceitfully from Udall in order that, the time having expired, they might first recover the £5 from him, and then obtain the letters of protection.

But this deponent sayeth that he did saye and declare unto the seyd Udall upon the Tower Hill as they mett together by chaunce there/ that he dyd moche dyssymble with Grenbery beyng a poor man and in daunger to dyverse men as he dyd know/ that he dyd not restore to hym the half of the ten poundes that he had receyved.\*

Lastly, *John Swallowe*, also of St. Dunstan's, another supporter of Grenebery's, denied that he had any part in securing the services of Mr. Garth to make suit to the Lord Chancellor. He met Udall at the Chancellor's house, and after some talk told him to keep his bond, but he said nothing, knowing nothing, of Grenebery's debts to Udall. He denied saying that the matter would have succeeded if the advice of Grenebery's wife had been followed which appears to have been that Udall should have the warrant and see the suit through. Nor had he ever said that "Grenebery wold in nowise condescend (to this) but his wiff was reasonable inoughe." It is from Swallow's evidence that we learn of the "chamber of the seyd Udall within the said Grenberies house."

As there is no decree given, so far as I have discovered, one must draw one's own conclusions as to the general equity of the case. I hope that Wilson had had the £5 that Udall refused to refund. It is obvious that Grenebery was in debt, that he owed money to his lodger, Udall, and it appears that he was seeking protection under the Statute of Usury of 1552. The real beneficiary, if the virtuallership had been granted, would I believe have been Welles. It is probably true that the defendants did not give Udall a chance to use Lord Willoughby's warrant himself to secure the letters of protection.

#### IV.

The interest of the story I have told lies to some extent in its bearing on the problem of the date of Udall's *Roister Doister*. As Wilson left Eton in the same year as his master, Udall, we may

\* Udall, as schoolmaster to young Courtenay in the Tower, might well be met on Tower Hill. St. Dunstons in the East is in Tower Ward.

assume that if *Roister Doister* had been an Eton play the long quotations from it introduced "*mense januarie 1553*," i.e. 1554, would not have escaped the first and second editions of the *Arte of Logique*.

The late J. W. Hales stated a very strong case against the claims of Eton in *Englische Studien* in 1893. The play is, he argued, later than Heywood's *Proverbs* (1545), and probably later than the Usury Act of 1552. Mr. Hales suggested, firstly, that 1552 was the date of the play, and, secondly, that Udall's headmastership of Westminster had already then begun. Mr. A. W. Pollard, knowing that in the autumn of 1553, at the commencement of Mary's reign, Udall was "schoolmaster" to Gardiner, dated the play 1553. I venture the opinion that Mr. Pollard is right, and that the earliest record we have of Udall's comedy is appropriately enough in the third edition of his friend and former pupil's *Arte of Logique*.

There are passages in *Roister Doister* which lend support to this view and have some bearing on the story we have told. *Roister Doister* is confessing to Merygreek that he is in love :

*Merygreek.* What, is it than ?  
Are ye in daunger of debt to any man ?  
If ye be, take no thought nor be not afraide,  
Let them hardly take thought how they shall be paide.  
*R. Doister.* Tut, I owe nought.  
*Merygreek.* What then ? fear ye imprisonment ?  
*R. Doister.* No.  
*Merygreek.* No, I wist ye offend not so to be shent  
But if ye had, the Toure coulde not you so holde  
But to breake out at all times ye would be bold.

Again, we may note the appropriateness of the reference to usury and the Exchequer in Act V. Scene VI. :

*C. Custance.* Sure I will put you up into the Exhequer.  
*Merygreek.* Wherefore ?  
*C. Custance.* For an usurer.

Compare this with a passage in Udall's bill of complaint in the Chancery suit :

Speaking of his loans to Grenebery, he complains that though the defendant had promised repayment yet :

Preveleging hymself in the kynges exhequier and by virtu ther of myndyng to avoyd all manner of paying of any parte of his debtes unto any man hath of late contrary to his former agrement and promes . . .

comensed an accion upon the said byll before the Shryves of London  
ageynst your orator.

This appears to be an early example of the use to which the Usury Act of 1552 might be put, a point which Mr. Hales had conjectured without any knowledge of Udall's suit.

Finally, though "the Arms of Calais" was a Skeltonic expression,\* it takes a new significance in 1553 after Udall's experience of what the "seal and arms of Calais" were worth when the Lord Chancellor refused to confirm them under the great seal of England.

## V.

I have said nothing of the subsequent career of Wilson, of his exile in Italy with Cheke in Mary's reign, or of his adventures abroad. He flourished under Elizabeth, becoming a Privy Councillor and Secretary of State, benefitting then, as he had suffered earlier, from his attachment to the Dudleys. These things happened after Udall's death. That he was a man of character who made his way from a subordinate position to one of eminence is not without significance. The offence for which Udall was dismissed from Eton was the gravest that can be alleged against a headmaster. As has already been said, Wilson's Eton days were spent under Udall and both left in 1541. It is difficult to believe that Wilson would have made use of his influence with the Duchess of Suffolk and the Willoughbys through their children, his pupils, if he had had any doubt as to Udall's innocence. His own credit would have been too nearly touched. Nor is it credible that he was ignorant of the Eton scandal. One can only conclude that the association of the two men with which I have been dealing in this paper argues an attitude on Wilson's part towards his old master that is not easily reconciled with the charge alleged in the Acts of the Privy Council.

\* *C. Custance*: Howe by this letter (a) of love? is it not fine?

*R. Royster*: By the armes of Caleys it is none of myne.

Act III. Sc. IV.

The phrase "By the armes of Calys" is found in Skelton's *Magnificence*, line 685.

(a) The letter that illustrated "ambiguitie" in the *Arte of Logique*.

## THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE ARTE OF ENGLISH POESIE : A SUGGESTION

BY B. M. WARD

### PART I.—THE CASE FOR PUTTENHAM.

THE *Arte of English Poesie* was published anonymously in 1589, and its authorship remained an enigma to all contemporary writers who mentioned it in their books for twenty-five years. In the volume itself, Richard Field, the printer, wrote a dedication to Lord Burghley, in which he says that the book came into his hands without any author's name.

Two years later, Sir John Harington, in the *Apology for Poetry* prefixed to his translation of *Orlando Furioso*—also printed by Richard Field—made the following statement :—

Neither do I suppose it to be greatly behoveful for this purpose, to . . . dispute how high and supernatural the name of a Maker is, so christened in English by that unknown godfather that this last year save one, viz. 1589, set forth a book called *The Arte of English Poesie*,

and a few lines further on alludes to the "unknown godfather" as "the same *Ignoto*." \* But although Sir John so emphatically denied all knowledge of the author's name, a remarkable contradiction to this professed ignorance was brought to light by Mr. Charles Hughes in 1910 in *Notes and Queries*, 11th ser. vol. i. p. 404. This contradiction occurs in no less a place than Harington's own manuscript † of the very same book—a manuscript we know to have been used by the printer because it contains printer's notes addressed to Richard Field himself. ‡ One of these directions (on f. 336) runs as follows :—

\* Edward Arber, *English Reprints*, vol. vii. p. 13 (1869). Dr. Gregory Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, 1904, p. 169.

† Brit. Mus. MS. Addit. 18920.

‡ See a full account of this MS. by Dr. W. W. Greg in the *Library*, 4th ser., iv. 102 ff., entitled "An Elizabethan Printer and his Copy."



Mr. Field, . . . I would have the allegory, as also the apology and all the prose that is to come, except the table, in the same print that Putnam's book is.

As Mr. Hughes points out, the type employed in the allegory, apology, and prose, is the same as the type used in the *Arte*; and he concludes the announcement of his discovery thus :—

This message to Field may be accepted as the absolute proof that Puttenham wrote the *Arte of English Poesie*, which its recent editor, Mr. Gregory Smith, considered as hitherto not forthcoming. It is curious that Harington, in the introduction to the volume as to which he was giving instructions to his publisher, described the *Arte* as set forth by an "unknown godfather."

In 1605, William Camden, in his *Remaines of a greater Work*, mentions the author of the *Arte* thus :—

Of the dignity of poetry much hath been said by the worthy Sir Philip Sidney, and by the gentleman which proved that Poets were the first Politicians, the first Philosophers, the first Historiographers (cf. Arber, p. 15).

"The gentleman which proved, etc.," is, of course, an obvious reference to the anonymous author of the *Arte*; and it shows that in 1605 Camden either did not know, or else refused to divulge, the name of the author of the *Arte*.

In 1614 the second edition of Camden's *Remaines* was published. In this edition appeared for the first time a paper by Richard Carew on *The Excellency of the English Tongue*. On p. 42 Carew says :—

And in a word to close up these proofs of our copiousness, look into our imitations of all sorts of verses afforded by any other language; and you shall find that Sir Philip Sidney, Master Puttenham, Master Stanishurst, and divers more, have made use how far we are within compass of a fore imagined possibility in that behalf (cf. Arber, p. 15).

This does not of course mean that Puttenham wrote the *Arte*; but it is at least a proof that Carew knew him to be a poet.

Some time after 1614, Edmund Bolton wrote his *Hypercritica*, which has been reprinted by Haslewood in his *Ancient Critical Essays*, vol. ii. Bolton makes the following remark about the *Arte of English Poesie* :—

Queen Elizabeth's verses, those which I have seen and read, some extant in the elegant, witty, and artificial book of the *Art of English*

*Poetrie*, (the work as the fame is) of one of her Gentlemen Pensioners, Puttenham, are princely as her prose.

Now Bolton is clearly speaking from hearsay ; and as he is writing *after* the second edition of Camden's *Remaines* was published, it is quite possible Carew's paper gave him the suggestion.

These are the only contemporaneous references connecting Puttenham with the *Arte*, and, on the face of it, the evidence would appear conclusive. On the strength of this a certain Richard Puttenham has been identified as the probable author.\* His life can be read in the *D.N.B.* so I do not propose going into it here ; but in the argument which follows I shall have occasion to touch on all the known facts about him.

It is when we come to the internal evidence of the book itself that our difficulties begin. The author of the *Arte* gives us many personal recollections which are quite definite and unmistakable. I cannot go into them all here, but a few will be sufficient.

1. The author states :—

Also in our Eclogue entitled *Elpine* which we made being but eighteen years old to King Edward the sixth, a prince of great hope."

As King Edward VI. reigned from 1547 to 1553 it follows that the author was born between 1529 and 1535 ; but Richard Puttenham was born in 1520.†

2. The author relates a story from which it is evident that he was in close touch with the Court on the occasion of the opening of Parliament in 1553, which he probably attended in person. The story will be given in detail later ; the point to notice now is that Richard Puttenham was not then, nor was he at any other time, a member of Parliament.

3. The author relates an incident that occurred at a feast—of

\* Most recent critics agree that Richard Puttenham's claim is the stronger ; but Arber (in 1869) and the *Encyc. Brit.* 11th ed. (1910) claim the *Arte* for George Puttenham, Richard's brother. As I shall show later this claim can be completely refuted, so I do not propose to deal with it at present. The *D.N.B.* says : " There is great difficulty in determining to which of Throckmorton's two brothers-in-law—to Richard or to George Puttenham—this epitaph, with the rest of the work (*i.e.* the *Arte*), should be assigned. Such evidence as is procurable points to the elder brother (*i.e.* Richard)."

† At the Inquisition Post Mortem held on the property of Sir Thomas Elyot in 1546, Richard Puttenham, his heir, was stated to have been twenty-six years old at Elyot's death. (" . . . et quod predictus Ricardus Puttenham fuit tempore mortis dicti Thome Eliott plene etatis videlicet, XXVI. annos et amplius.") Chancery Series 2, vol. 74, No. 16.

which he was a "beholder"—given in Brussels to Henry Earl of Arundel by the Duchess of Parma, Regent of the Netherlands. Lord Arundel left England for Padua on March 19, 1565/6; and in the story we are told that it was on the way out that the feast occurred.

Now it is certainly true that Richard Puttenham was abroad at that time, but he was abroad under conditions which, in my opinion, entirely preclude the possibility of his being present at a Royal dinner party in the company of so distinguished a man as the Earl of Arundel. In 1561 he received permission to live abroad for three years.\* He was ordered to return on June 24, 1563,† but he disobeyed the order; and it was not till January 27, 1570, that he returned to England, when he received a pardon for his absence without leave.‡ Moreover, we know from the story§ that the author must have been in Lord Arundel's suite, and it is clearly out of the question for Richard Puttenham to have crossed the Channel on March 19, 1565/6, because we know he was abroad at the time.

4. The author says that he was a scholar at Oxford; but, as we read in the *D.N.B.*, no student of the name of Puttenham figures in the Oxford University registers.

5. The author in several places alludes to certain poems called the *Partheniades*, which are known to have been presented to Queen Elizabeth as a New Year's present by their author on January 1, 1579.¶ The *D.N.B.* suggests that "the poems were a peace offering from Richard, who, after his long absence and disgrace, was endeavouring to regain his lost reputation." But this statement does not, I submit, bear looking into. First, we know that he was pardoned in 1570; why then should he wait nine years before presenting his peace offering? Secondly, even supposing he did so far re-establish his position with the Queen as to get her to accept his poetical New Year's gift, we should surely expect to find him presenting New Year's gifts to Her Majesty on some other occasions; but Puttenham's name does not appear once in the many lists of donors of New Year's presents to the Queen.¶¶

\* Court of Requests: (Books), 8 Eliz.

† *Ibid.*

‡ Pat. Roll. 1061, m. 24, 12 Eliz.

§ See pp. 297-8.

¶ Cf. Arber, *op. cit.*, p. 11, and *D.N.B.*

¶¶ See Nichols: *Progresses*, vols. i. and ii.

6. The author describes an incident that occurred during one of the Queen's progresses :—

A lewd term to be given to a Princes treasure (pelfe) ; and was a little more mannerly spoken by Serjeant Bendlowes, when, in a progress time, coming to salute the Queen in Huntingdonshire, he said to her coachman : " Stay thy cart, my good fellow, stay thy cart, that I may speak to the Queen." Whereat Her Majesty laughed as she had been tickled, and all the rest of the company, although very graciously (as her manner is) she gave him great thanks and her hand to kiss.

Now it is, of course, arguable that the author did not actually witness the incident described ; but about the two following facts there is no argument :—

(a) That the only progress undertaken by the Queen to Huntingdonshire before 1588 was in 1564.\*

(b) That Richard Puttenham was abroad from 1561 to 1570.

In my opinion it seems more probable that the author actually saw and heard the incident described ; but even if we assume it was related to him by a third party it is almost inconceivable that it could have been recounted to Richard Puttenham, who did not return to England until six years after the episode—and a very trivial episode at that—had taken place.

7. Finally, as Oldys says :—

That Puttenham was a courtier is visible . . . he may be called the Court critic of that reign.†

I think everybody will agree that the author of the *Arte* was a courtier ; but there is not one shred of evidence to show that Puttenham was ever in the Court for a single minute.

In addition to these seven items, which are virtually sufficient to rule out the possibility of Richard Puttenham's authorship of the *Arte*, there is one piece of external evidence which, in my opinion, goes far to make his authorship untenable ; this is the undeniable fact that Richard was in prison in Her Majesty's Bench—a criminal prison—in a state of complete penury both before and after the

\* It is true that in 1566, during the famous Progress to Oxford University, the Queen passed through Kimbolton, a town just inside the borders of Huntingdonshire ; but the allusion is much more likely to refer to the Progress of 1564. Vide Nichols' *Progresses* and *The Elizabethan Stage*, by E. K. Chambers, vol. iv. p. 83.

† Dr. Gregory Smith, in the Introduction to his *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, frequently talks of "the courtier Puttenham."

publication of the *Arte* in 1589, viz. from 1583 until 1597. The evidence for this is given by Collier :—

From the Book of Decrees of the Court of Requests we learn that in 28 Eliz. Richard Puttenham was in most distressed circumstances, having been four years in prison, and having had to maintain "a proud, stubborn woman, his wife, in unbridled liberty"; he was thus worth no more than "the simple garment on his back" (*Notes and Queries*, ser. 2, vol. xii. p. 143).

This tells us that Richard Puttenham was in prison from 1583 to 1587; and, moreover, this evidence is corroborated and supplemented from three other sources. First, in *S.P. Dom. Eliz.*, vol. 183, art. 66, we find a document dated October 30, 1585, written by Richard Puttenham to the Lords of the Council, in which he describes himself as "a prisoner for the second time."\* Secondly, from a decree in the Court of Requests under date October 12, 1587, we can definitely locate Richard Puttenham as a "prisoner in Her Majesty's Bench" in November 1586, and again in August 1587. Finally, in April 1597 he made his will, in which he describes himself as "now prisoner in Her Majesty's Bench."

Now I hold that anybody reading this evidence must agree that it is practically certain that Richard Puttenham was continuously in a criminal prison from 1583 until he made his will in 1597. How can this be reconciled with the generally admitted fact that the *Arte* was written between 1584 and 1588 and published in 1589? †

These absolutely insurmountable difficulties in the way of assigning the authorship to Richard Puttenham or his brother George ‡ decided me to examine more closely the external evidence, which, it will be remembered, seemed pretty good.

\* Both Mr. Croft in his edition of *The Governour* by Sir Thomas Elyot and the *D.N.B.* are in error in dating this document 1588. The mistake evidently arose through the final 5 of 1585 being somewhat like an 8; but the document has been calendared 1585 by the Record Office authorities without query.

† Cf. Arber, *Introd.*, "The [*Arte of English Poesie*] appears to have been written between June 1584 and November 1588. . . . This is proved not only by the general tenour of contemporary allusion, as by the following particulars among other." (Here follow five reasons proving this from internal evidence, which need not be gone into here.)

‡ The case for George Puttenham's authorship is still advocated in the *Encyc. Brit.* eleventh ed. vol. xxii. p. 671, but as he was certainly in England throughout 1566, and, indeed, never seems to have been abroad at all, his case seems to me hopeless from the start. Moreover, he was imprisoned on December 21, 1578, which makes it difficult to understand how he managed to present the *Parthemades* to the Queen on January 1, 1579! It is perhaps unnecessary to add that he was never at Oxford, never an M.P., and there is no evidence to show that he was ever at Court.





Puttenham, as we have seen, was mentioned three times by contemporary writers: first by Sir John Harington in 1591; secondly, by Richard Carew in 1614; and finally, by Edward Bolton

rounde then your company, less see your backe, come againe when  
I bid you, when you are called, sent for, intreated, willed,  
desired, invited, spare vs your place, another in your steed, a  
scape of Salt for you, save your credite, you are next the doore,  
the doore is open for you, there is no body holdeth you, no body  
teares your sleepe, &c. Likewise this word *Fortis* wee may  
synonymize after all these fashions, stout, hardy, valiant,  
doughty, couragious, aduencrous, &c.

And in a word, to close vp these proofs of our copious- All sorts of  
nesse, looke into our Imitations of all sorts of verses as  
foorded by any other language, and you shall finde that  
Sir.

### of the English tongue. 43

Sir Philip Sidney, Maister Puttenham, Maister Stanburis,  
and diuers more haue made vs how farre wee are with-  
in compasse of a fore imagined possibilitie in that be-  
halfe.

I come now to the last and sweetest point of the Sweetnesse  
sweetnesse of our tongue, which shall appeare the more  
plainely, if like two Turkeyes or the London Drapers  
wee match it with our neighbours. The Italian is plea-  
sant but without sinewes as a still fleeting water. The  
French, delicate, but euen nice as a woman, scarce da- Compared  
ring to open her lippes for feare of marring her coun- with others.  
tenance. The Spanish maiesticall, but fullsome, run-

PLATE II.—From Camden's *Remaines*, 2nd ed., 1614, pp. 42 and 43.

some time shortly after this date. I propose to deal first with the evidence of Richard Carew.

On page 290 and above will be found two facsimiles—a pas-  
sage from Richard Carew's holograph *The Excellency of the English  
Tongue*; and parts of pages 42 and 43 of the second (1614) edition of  
Camden's *Remaines*, in which Carew's paper was published. As the  
great surprise revealed by these two documents was discovered many

years ago by the late Rev. Walter Begley I cannot do better than quote his own words :—

Quite by chance, I happened to hear that Richard Carew's original MS. was in the British Museum, and on making inquiries I found it among other papers of Camden's, which at his death in 1623 came into the Cottonian Collection of MSS., and had been arranged and bound together in large folio volumes. I took a printed copy of Camden's *Remains* (1614) containing the first notice of Puttenham by Carew, and began to collate the MS. and the book word for word. I found that the printer had copied the MS. very accurately, and had even reproduced from it the curious reading, "Shakespeare and Barlowe's fragment," which has always been supposed to be an early reference to Shakespeare and Marlowe, muddled by the printer. But I found Carew's MS. had it so most legibly; in fact the MS. and the book agreed word for word, except in one instance, where a later hand in blacker ink had crossed out "couler" and written "colored" above it, and the printed text had "coloured."

And now came the great surprise. When I came to the Puttenham passage, *Maister Puttenham was not there*, and never had been, for there was no room for him in the MS., for, while the printed *Remaines* read "Sir Philip Sidney, Maister Puttenham, Maister Stanihurst," the MS. had most plainly, without blot or erasure, "Sir Philip Sidney, Mr. Stanihurst."

So it became pretty plain that *Maister Puttenham* had been foisted in between Sidney and Stanihurst since Carew's MS. had been received by Camden—for it is clear enough that Camden *did* receive this very MS., for it owes its salvation to being amongst the papers left by Cotton.

How are we to explain this manipulation of the Carew MS. in *one place only*, and done there with a view to foist Puttenham on the public for the first time? It looks as if some one wanted to bring him into notice, although he had been dead more than twenty years, and his name never mentioned for poetry or the art of poetry by any one previously.\*

Thus at the outset we are compelled to admit that the evidence of Carew is, to say the least, far from straightforward. Between 1589 and 1614 Harington, Harvey, Nash, Meres, and Camden all wrote and published essays dealing with poets and poetry.† In these essays we find a great many authors and poets mentioned, but nowhere do we find the name Puttenham until the interpolation by Camden I have just mentioned. Both Harington (in 1591), and Camden (in 1605), cite the author of the *Arte* as an anonymous individual, whose name they either cannot or will not disclose. After 1614 we get Edmund Bolton's piece of hearsay that the *Arte* was *supposed* to have been written by a certain Puttenham, one of Her Majesty's

\* Begley, *Bacon's Nova Resuscitatio*, vol. i. p. 104.

† See Gregory Smith, *op. cit.* vol. ii.

Gentlemen Pensioners ; but Bolton is obviously ill informed because there is no mention of the name Puttenham in the rolls of Queen Elizabeth's Gentlemen Pensioners.\*

How, then, are we to account for Sir John Harington's note to Richard Field which so definitely assigns the authorship of the *Arte* to a certain Putnam ? If we take the evidence at its face value we must, of course, admit that it is conclusive. But we have just seen that it is absolutely impossible for either Richard or George Puttenham to have written the book. Have we, then, any reasonable grounds for supposing that Harington's statement cannot be taken at its face value ?

In my opinion the answer is in the affirmative. We must first of all remember that Richard Field had published the *Arte*, and had written in it a dedication to Lord Burghley, in which he says that the MS. came into his hands "without any author's name." I cannot believe that Field was really in ignorance as to who was the author of the book. He had just set up as a publisher, and it is unlikely that he would, on his own initiative, have published a MS. written by some one whose name he did not know, but whose rank was sufficiently high to make him an habitu   of the Court. It seems far more plausible that Field knew the real author's name : that this author desired the anonymous publication of his MS. : and that his name was not Puttenham.

The hypothesis I put forward is this. Let us suppose that the author—some courtier unknown to us but not to Field—was alive in 1588, and wished to publish his MS., which is really a defence of poets and poetry against the Puritan attacks. This author being by hypothesis a courtier, cannot bring out the book under his own name.† Now, if the book were published anonymously, and no hint as to authorship given, it would surely not be long before people reading it would guess whence it originated. I suggest, therefore, that our author went to Richard Field,‡ asked him to publish the book

\* "Mr. Selby, of the Public Record Office, who at the request of the editor kindly undertook to search the roll of the Gentlemen Pensioners for the whole reign of Elizabeth, has informed him that they contain no entry of the name of Puttenham" (Croft, *op. cit.* p. 85).

† It is an undeniable fact, though not always fully recognised, that few works—whether prose or poetry—written by Elizabethan Courtiers were ever published while they were alive. Their writings were circulated in MS. among their friends for their private enjoyment.

‡ Or possibly to Thomas Orwin, to whom the book was originally entered in the Stationers' Register. The circumstances in which it was, three months later, "put over" to Richard Field are not known.

anonymously, but, at the same time, told him to give out vague and undefined hints that the book, as far as he knew, "was by a fellow called Putnam, or something of the sort," adding, in a confidential whisper, "a bit of a bad hat, you know; got into trouble some years ago, and is now in prison."

A hint of this kind would have been quite sufficient to stop too many inquiries about the author; and it was probably an echo of this vague suggestion that reached Edmund Bolton twenty-five years later when he said that rumour had it that the *Arte* was by a Gentleman Pensioner called Puttenham. It would, moreover, explain why Harington, who we know was in close touch with Field,\* and therefore probably in the secret, should have spoken of the *Arte* in his *published book* as by "an unknown god-father," and at the same time when writing *privately* to Field called it "Putnam's book."

Then, again, consider what Camden has to say. In 1605 (in the first edition of his *Remaines*) he distinctly lets it be known that he either cannot or will not give the author's name. But both Richard and George Puttenham were then dead. In 1614 Camden brings out the second edition of his *Remaines*, in which we find the same professed ignorance of the author's name. But is he really so ignorant? If so, why should he deliberately insert the name "Maister Puttenham" in Carew's paper, which he was incorporating in this very same book?

But I must now call a halt. I am fully aware that hypotheses are perfectly valueless unless they can be supported with facts. Where, then, are we to get these facts? Harington, Camden, Field, and "Maister Puttenham," have none of them left the slightest clue to help us. But there is one witness we have not yet called on—the hypothetical author. In the following pages I propose to examine the internal evidence provided by the *Arte*, with a view to arriving at certain definite facts about its author.

#### PART 2.—THE UNKNOWN AUTHOR.

Now it may appear at first glance that to attempt to locate the author of an anonymous book without having a single clue from outside sources as to his identity is a hopeless task. But to this I cannot

\* The fact that Harington's precise instructions to Field were carried out down to the smallest detail argues, as Mr. Hughes says, "how closely Elizabeth's godson superintended the bringing out of his books" (cf. *Notes and Queries*, ser. 11, vol. i. p. 404).

agree. I hold that so far from knowing nothing about the author we really know a very great deal—that, in fact, he reveals himself to us throughout his book. I do not mean by this that we can draw evidence from his style ; for that inevitably gives rise to controversy. But both in a general way, from the whole tenor of the book, and in a more particular way, from the personal anecdotes that he recounts, we can reconstruct with a considerable degree of detail, the sort of man he was and the sort of life he led.

First, then, we can unhesitatingly say that he was a courtier ; and, moreover, not one who was admitted at infrequent intervals into the inner circle of Court life, but one who habitually lived at Court both at home and abroad—particularly the latter, because in one place he says he has observed certain characteristics

Specially in the Courtiers of foreign countries, where in my youth I was brought up, and very well observed their manner of life and conversation, for of mine own country I have not made so great experience ;

and in another place :—

I myself having seen the Courts of France, Spain, Italy, and that of the Empire ;

and again, speaking of the English Court :—

I have seen foreign ambassadors in the Queen's presence laugh so dissolutely at some rare pastime or sport that hath been made there.

From this, I maintain, we can fairly deduce that our author is to be found in the ranks of the aristocracy, whose parents, for some reason, lived abroad when he was young. This reason we can only guess at ; the most probable being either State employment in a foreign embassy, or exile following on Royal disfavour.

Secondly, the author of the *Arte* was without doubt a fine scholar. His knowledge of the Classics was great, even for an age when Latin and Greek were very much " live " languages among the cultured classes. It is evident, moreover, that he had plenty of leisure to read, digest, and ponder ; the *Arte* was not written in hurried moments snatched from the stress of business at the Council table, or on active service. Now Statesmanship and Generalship in war were the two professions normally open to the aristocracy of those days ; and it was only when unemployed—and such unemployment was invariably the result of the Royal autocrat's displeasure—that the

courtier would turn to literature to occupy his mind. The most famous instance of this is the temporary banishment from the Court of Sir Philip Sidney to which we owe *The Arcadia* and *The Apologie for Poetry*. It is therefore in the ranks of the unemployed aristocracy that we may expect to find the author of the *Arte*.

Thirdly, we have it on his own authority that he was an author and a poet before he wrote the *Arte*. He names three of his prose, and ten of his poetical compositions. Only one—the series of poems called the *Partheniades*—has come down to us, and this only in the form of an incomplete copy, in which the author is expressly stated to be anonymous. These poems were presented by their author to the Queen on January 1, 1579. Although we know that a great deal of literature—both prose and poetry—written in the Elizabethan age has been lost, I cannot help thinking that it is rather odd that none of these other works from the pen of the author of the *Arte* were ever printed—for if they had been printed there would surely be some trace of them either in the Stationers' Register, or a passing notice in another book. But they remain veiled in mystery. I can only suggest that, following the usual custom among aristocratic authors, these works were passed round and read in manuscript only, and never published. The Earl of Surrey, Sir Thomas Wyatt, Lord Vaux, and Sir Philip Sidney all wrote poetry, none of which was ever published until they were dead. This is simply one more indication that our author was independent of literature as a means of livelihood; for had he been a professional writer surely his object would have been to publish as much as possible; and it is impossible to imagine that not a single publisher in London could be found to print anything else by the author of the *Arte of English Poesie*! The conclusion I draw from the foregoing is that we need not expect to find our author among the well-known professional literary men of the day; nor should we expect to find his name on the title pages of any printed volumes.

Looked at from a general point of view we should, then, expect to find in our author the following characteristics:—

1. That he was a courtier.
2. That he was an aristocrat.
3. That he was a scholar.
4. That he was brought up abroad.
5. That in the 'eighties (when he was writing the *Arte*) he was not employed either politically or militarily.



6. That, except for the *Arte*, he was a "manuscript" author only, and printed nothing else under his own name.

Let us now turn to his more particular characteristics and classify them in the same way. These are all based on his own personal reminiscences, and are scattered throughout the book. He states :—

Also in our Eclogue entitled *Elpine*, which we made being but eighteen years old to King Edward the Sixth, a prince of great hope.

From this we know that he was born between 1529 and 1535.\*

I have already referred to the anecdote told on the occasion of the opening of Parliament in the first year of Queen Mary's reign. The story runs as follows :—

I remember in the first year of Queen Mary's reign a Knight of Yorkshire was chosen speaker of the Parliament, a good gentleman and wise in the affairs of his shire, and not unlearned in the laws of the Realm, but as well for some lack of his teeth, as for want of language nothing well spoken, which at that time and business was most behoveful for him to have been : this man, after he had made his oration to the Queen—which ye know is of course to be done at the first assembly of both houses—a bencher of the Temple, both well learned and very eloquent, returning from the Parliament House, asked another gentleman his friend how he liked Mr. Speaker's oration. . . .

This incident occurred on October 9, 1553, when, according to Willis's *Notitia Parl.*, Pt. II. iii. 29, ed. 1750 :—

On Monday afternoon Mr. Speaker made an excellent oration before the Queen's Highness sitting in the Royal seat in Parliament Chamber, all the Nobles and Commons assembled.

This would seem to limit our author to the 300 odd members of the House of Lords and the House of Commons ; for the story gives the impression that our author was an actual eyewitness to the incident he describes so graphically.

I have already mentioned the incident when the author was a "beholder" of the feast given by the Duchess of Parma to Henry, Earl of Arundel. This occurred in 1566, for in March of that year Lord Arundel left England passing through the Netherlands *en route* for Italy. The story runs as follows :—

On a time passing from England towards Italy by Her Majesty's license, (the Earl of Arundel) was very honourably entertained at the Court

\* Cf. Arber, pp. 11 and 180. Edward VI. reigned from 1547 to 1553.

of Brussels by the Lady Duchess of Parma, Regent there : and sitting at a banquet with her—where also was the Prince of Orange, with all the greatest Princes of the State—the Earl, though he could reasonably well speak French, would not speak one French word, but all English, whether he asked any question or answered it, but all was done by Truchemen. In so much as the Prince of Orange marvelling at it, *looked aside on that part where I stood, a beholder of the feast*, and said : “ I marvel your noblemen of England do not desire to be better languaged in foreign languages.” This word was by and by reported to the Earl. (My italics.)

From this story I infer that our author was a member of Lord Arundel's suite ; and further that he was not a page or a servant because in that case the Prince of Orange would not have addressed to him the remark that he did. This, then, considerably narrows down the circle in which we need search ; for we need only look for him in the few gentlemen attending on Lord Arundel on the occasion of his visit to Italy in 1566.

The next *dated* clue that we have is an anecdote told of a certain M. de Sipier. I give the story in full :—

In the time of Charles, the ninth French King, I being at the Spaw waters, there lay a Marshall of France called Monsieur de Sipier, to use those waters for his health, but when the physicians had all given him up, and that there was no hope of life in him, came from the King to him a letters patents of 6,000 crowns yearly pension during his life, with many comfortable words : the man was not so much past remembrance, but he could say to the messenger, “ Trop tard, trop tard, it should have come before,” for indeed it had been promised long and came not till now that he could not fare the better by it.

Mr. Croft was the first to identify “ M. de Sipier ” with François de Scepeaux, sire de Vieilleville, who was made a Marshal of France in 1562, and in 1569 received a present of 10,000 crowns from the King. But in two important respects Vieilleville cannot be reconciled with “ M. de Sipier.” First, “ François de Scepeaux ” is simply the patronymic of the man whose title was “ Sire de Vieilleville,” and nobody would have thought of referring to him as “ de Scepeaux ” any more than they would have spoken of “ Henry FitzAlan ” when they meant the Earl of Arundel. Secondly, Vieilleville, so far from dying at *Spa* immediately after receiving his present of 10,000 crowns, enjoyed the King's gift for at least two years longer, dying in 1571 *at Duretal, in Brittany*. These facts, in my opinion, entirely rule out the identification of Vieilleville with “ M. de Sipier.”

It was while looking through a French encyclopædia to see if I could find somebody else who would meet the case, that my eye fell on the name "de Cypièrre." The short account of his life said nothing beyond the facts that he was a distinguished soldier and that he died in 1566. I accordingly wrote to Professor Abel Lefranc, of the Collège de France, who is the greatest living authority on French history in the sixteenth century, and, quoting the passage from the *Arte*, asked him his opinion as to whether either Vieilleville or de Cypièrre could be identified with "M. de Sipier." I give his answer in full:—

Paris, le 31 Janvier 1925.

Il n'y a pas de doute pour moi : il s'agit de Philibert de Marcilly, seigneur de Cypièrre, mort à Liège en Septembre 1566. Il fut gouverneur de Charles IX. "C'était," dit de Thou, "un homme de bien et un grand capitaine." S'il n'avait pas la qualité de maréchal de France, il avait une situation et une réputation digne de ce haut grade. Spa était tout près de Liège, et beaucoup de baigneurs résidaient dans cette ville même pour prendre les eaux. (Ex. Marguerite de Valois.) On écrivait autrefois Sipierre, d'ou Sipier chez votre auteur.

ABEL LEFRANC.

This shows conclusively that our unknown author was at Spa in September 1566.

The only other dated reference is the trivial incident—already referred to—that took place in Huntingdonshire in 1564. We cannot say definitely that the author was personally in progress with the Court when it occurred although it seems probable that he was; but we may be assured not only that he must have been in England at the time, but that he must have been at the Court very soon afterwards, or he would certainly never have heard of it.

There remain two other undated incidents in the author's life : that he was a scholar at Oxford; and that he wrote an epitaph on "his dear friend" Sir John Throckmorton.\*

\* This latter has been put forward in all the lives of the Puttenhames as a strong piece of evidence that the *Arte* was by one of them. Sir John had married their sister Margery; and Mr. Croft says: "There seems little difficulty in attributing the (epitaph) to the pen of a near relative" (p. clxxxiv.). This sounds very reasonable; but when we read in the *Cal. S.P. Dom.* 1547-80, that Throckmorton and George Puttenham were engaged in furious quarrel between November 1578 and July 1579, during which time both of them seem to have been arrested and kept under restraint, it would appear that Sir John can hardly be described as a friend of the family! His opinion of George Puttenham is particularly lucid: "This sheweth you to be such [a] one as your enemies account you; when your own turn is served

We may, therefore, classify what I have called the "particular" references to our author as follows :—

7. That he was born between 1529 and 1535.
8. That he was educated at Oxford.
9. That he was present in Parliament on October 9, 1553.
10. That he accompanied Lord Arundel to the Low Countries in March 1566.
11. That he was at Spa in September 1566.
12. That he presented the *Partheniades* to the Queen on January 1, 1579.
13. That he was probably in progress with the Court in Huntingdonshire in 1564.
14. That he was a friend of Sir John Throckmorton.

Let us now see if there is any individual who will answer to these fourteen points.

#### PART 3.—JOHN, LORD LUMLEY, 1532-1609.

The life of Lord Lumley is given in the *D.N.B.*, so here I only propose to touch on those incidents with which we are concerned. The suggestion I make, viz. that Lord Lumley does, indeed, answer to the fourteen points just postulated, cannot perhaps be claimed as an absolute proof that he was the author of the *Arte*. But what I shall show is that, taking these fourteen characteristics, Lumley definitely fits the majority (including all the dated ones); while the others, owing to lack of complete evidence, can only be assigned to him on the grounds of a more than probable likelihood; but *in no case* is his life *in any way* at variance with the internal evidence in the *Arte*.

I shall start with the six dated facts that we know about the author—Nos. 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13.

7. That he was born between 1529 and 1535.

The *D.N.B.*, following Lumley's life in the *Athenæ Cantabrigienses*, gives 1534 with a query as the date of Lumley's birth. From an examination of the *Journals of the House of Lords* I find that the first occasion Lumley's name is shown in the list of peers is on October 5, 1553. As minors are not shown in these lists he must have come of age shortly before this date; from which we may deduce

careless of all men, ungrateful in prosperity, and unthankful in adversity" (*Cal. S.P. Dom. Eliz.* 1547-1580, p. 607; cf. *Cal. Hat. MSS.*, ii. 226). There is, unfortunately, no record of his opinion of Richard.

that he must have been born in 1532. It will be remembered that we derived this information from the following quotation in the *Arte* :—

Also in our Eclogue entitled *Elpine*, which we made being but eighteen years old to King Edward the Sixth, a prince of great hope.

Now it is significant that almost the first thing Edward VI. did on ascending the throne in 1547 was to sign the reversal of Sir George Lumley's attainder, and to restore John Lumley in blood to his grandfather's barony, which had become extinct on his death in 1544. It would, therefore, be only natural for Lumley to feel grateful to Edward VI., and to refer to him as a "prince of great hope." Moreover, we read in the *D.N.B.* that Lumley was brought up in the Court of Edward VI. This would be from 1547 onwards, when Lumley was fifteen and Edward ten. He would thus have had many opportunities of addressing an Eclogue to the young King, who was also, no doubt, his playfellow.

9. That he was in Parliament on October 9, 1553.

The *Journals of the House of Lords* show Lumley as actually present on this date.\*

10. That he was present at the Duchess of Parma's feast to Lord Arundel in March 1566.

We know from the *D.N.B.* that Lord Lumley was employed in 1566 to treat with the Duke of Florence over the matter of a debt which had been owing to England since the time of Henry the Eighth. His commission was signed by the Queen at Westminster on March 17, 1566.† We learn also from the same source that Lumley was a steady adherent of Arundel's, whose daughter he had married. We know also that Arundel left England for Padua on March 19, 1566,‡ and was entertained by the Duchess of Parma at Brussels on the way out. There is, therefore, strong presumptive evidence for supposing that Lumley travelled out to Italy in Lord Arundel's suite. But this is not all. Amongst Roger Ascham's correspondence is a letter :

\* Dr. Gregory Smith (*op. cit.*, vol. ii. p. 418) has suggested that the author of the *Arte* may have meant the first Parliament of *Elizabeth's* reign, when Sir Thomas Gargrave, who sat for Yorkshire, was elected speaker ; because in the first Parliament of Mary's reign the Speaker, Sir John Pollard, sat for Oxfordshire. This does not affect our argument here, since Lumley was also present on the occasion of Sir Thomas Gargrave's speech.

† Rymer's *Fœdera*, vol. xv. p. 654.

‡ Murdin, *Burghley State Papers* (ed. 1759), p. 761.

From Roger Ascham to Hieronymo Prioli, Doge, and the Senators of Venice.

On behalf of Lord Lumley and other English Nobles—complains that the Earl of Arundel has been ill treated at Padua by Daniel Foscarini and others.\*

The letter was written from the Palace in London, and is dated November 2, 1556. Now this date is clearly a misprint by Elstob for 1566, for two reasons: first, because Jerome Priuli was Doge of Venice from 1559 to 1567; † and secondly, because we know that the only occasion on which Lord Arundel was in Padua was in 1566. Arundel did not return to England till March 1566/7; but Lumley had completed his business with the Duke of Florence six months earlier, because from October 2, 1566, onwards we find him attending regularly at the House of Lords.

The inference is obvious. Before Lumley started back from Italy, the Earl of Arundel asked him to write officially from the Court at London about the ill-treatment he had received at the hands of Daniel Foscarini, which Lumley did on November 2nd. I think it may therefore be stated as categorical fact that Lord Lumley was at the feast given by the Duchess of Parma to the Earl of Arundel at Brussels in March 1566.‡

11. That he was at Spa in September 1566.

This follows naturally on what has just been said. I have shown that Lumley's first attendance at the House of Lords in 1566 was on October 2nd; so what could be more natural than to find him at Spa and Liège in September on his way home?

12. That he presented the *Partheniades* to the Queen on January 1, 1579.

It will be remembered that one of the arguments I employed against the Puttenham authorship of the *Arte* was the fact that neither Richard nor George ever gave a New Year present to the

\* *R. A. Epistolarum*, edited by Elstob (1703), p. 349, and *Works of Roger Ascham*, edited by Dr. Giles (1856), vol. i. I have been unable to trace the MS. from which Elstob made his transcript; none of the 16th-century editions contain this letter.

† See *Histoire de Venise*, P. Daru (1853), vol. iv. book xxvi. pp. 89-90.

‡ Since writing the above my attention has been drawn to *Records of the Lumleys*, by Edith Milner. In this book full details of the Florentine debt are given. It appears that in 1564 the Queen sold this apparently bad debt at a discount, the purchasers being the Earl of Arundel and Lord Lumley, each of whom paid Her Majesty so much in land. I think it will be agreed that this removes any lingering doubts as to whether Lumley went to Italy in company with Lord Arundel.



Queen. Nichols, in his *Progresses*,\* gives complete lists of New Year presents, both to and from the Queen, on many different occasions. Lord Lumley's name occurs in these lists in the following years :—

1562.	To the Queen	£20.	From the Queen,	A gilt cup.
1578.	do.	£10	do.	20 oz. plate.
1579.	do.	£10.	do.	do.
1584.	do.	A crystal cup.		
1587.	do.	A Book, wherein are divers Psalms in Latin, . . .		
1588.	do.	A crystal cup.		
1589.	do.	do.	do.	19 oz. plate.
1600.	do.	£10.	do.	20 oz. plate.

The foregoing list proves that Lumley was in the habit of giving New Year presents to the Queen. It also definitely locates him in the Royal Court on New Year's Day, 1579.

The fact that he presented £10 to the Queen on that day does not exclude the possibility of his having presented the *Partheniades* on the same occasion.

13. That he was probably in progress with the Court in Huntingdonshire in 1564.

The Royal progress to Cambridge, Huntingdonshire, and Lincolnshire in 1564 was in some ways the most important that Elizabeth ever undertook. It was her first visit to either of the two great Universities. Now we all know what a deep interest the Queen took in learning; and it is safe to say that very few men or women of her time could rival Roger Ascham's pupil in scholarship. Anybody reading the account of Her Majesty's visit to Cambridge in 1564 † can have little doubt that she undertook it with the definite objects of encouraging the University, and popularising a university education among her courtiers. Look, for example, at the list of courtiers on whom degrees were conferred on August 10th of this year. It is a remarkable fact that many of these graduates were men of mature age, who must long previously have completed their studies, whether at the University or elsewhere. There are altogether seventeen in the list—all men of the highest rank in the country. We find men like Lord Burghley, who was 37; the Duke of Norfolk, who was 28; the Earl of Sussex, who was 38; the Earl of Warwick, who was 36; Lord Robert Dudley (afterwards Earl of Leicester),

\* Second edition. The first edition (1788) only gives the New Year's gifts for 1579 and 1589.

† Nichols, *Progresses*, vol. i.

who was 32 ; Lord Clinton, who was 52 ; Lord Hunsdon, who was 40 ; Lord William Howard, who was 54 ; besides others of the younger generation.\* I cannot help feeling that this means that Elizabeth let it be clearly understood that she did not intend to have anybody round her who was not fit to hold a university degree ; a point of view which was, no doubt, heartily endorsed by such scholars as Lord Burghley.

What bearing has this on Lumley ? Well, Lumley graduated at Cambridge in 1549, that is to say at a time when it was far from being the regular thing for a nobleman to do so. This argues an unusual interest in learning—an interest we know Lumley to have had. It is therefore, I maintain, exceedingly unlikely either that Lumley would have refrained from accompanying the Court to his old University ; or that the Queen would not have insisted on his presence. Unfortunately the list of courtiers who went on this progress only contains the names of those who took degrees on August 10th ; and I can offer no definite evidence that Lumley was actually in attendance on this progress ; but it would have been a rare exception for a courtier who was in great favour, not to have accompanied his Sovereign on a progress. Until Lumley's presence on this occasion can be definitely proved or disproved, we may take it to all intents and purposes as certain that he went with the Queen to Cambridge and Huntingdon in August and September 1564.

Of the remaining characteristics Nos. 1, 2, and 6 (that he was a courtier, an aristocrat, and published nothing under his own name) speak for themselves. But I should just like to touch on the others.

3. That he was a scholar.

The fame of Lord Lumley's library is too well known to make more than a reference to it necessary here. It was almost certainly the finest in England. It was purchased, at Lumley's death, by King James for his son Prince Henry, and remained in the hands of the Kings and Queens of England until George the Third presented it to the British Museum, where it is known to-day as the "Royal Library." The catalogue of MSS. alone occupies three large quarto volumes.

In addition to this Lumley was a member of the Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries. MS. Cotton, Tit. B. v. f. 184, gives the names of the following, amongst others, who were members :—

\* The two youngest were the Earls of Rutland and Oxford, who were respectively 15 and 14. It would be interesting to know if the University records contain any other instance of such young graduates.

... Sir Philip Sidney; Henry, Earl of Arundel; Thomas, Lord Dorset; William, Lord Burghley; Herberts, Earls of Pembroke; *the learned Lord Lumley*; Sir Walter Cope; Sir Walter Raleigh; (etc.) . . .

4. That he was brought up abroad.

When Lumley was five years old—in 1537—his father, Sir George Lumley, was executed for the part he took in Aske's insurrection. This insurrection turned on religion, it being the avowed object of Aske and his followers to re-establish the Catholic Church. Thirty-four years later (in 1571) Lumley narrowly escaped his father's fate, for he was deeply implicated in the Ridolfi plot (he was "30" in the famous cipher letters of Baily)—which also aimed at the overthrow of the Reformed religion. That Lumley was ready to risk his life in the Catholic cause, after his father's example, argues an upbringing in the Roman Church; but such an upbringing would clearly have been impossible in England during the last ten years of Henry the Eighth's reign. We know that it was not till 1547—when Edward the Sixth came to the throne—that Lumley was restored in blood; but where did he spend the years between the ages of five and fifteen, so critical in the formation of a man's character? I have been unable to find any trace of him during those years; but I offer the following suggestion. Knowing the unhappy position of a widow, whose husband has been executed for treason, it seems not unlikely that Lady Lumley would have eagerly accepted an offer to adopt her son, had such an offer been made. It is significant that the Earl of Arundel had a son—Lord Maltravers, who died in 1556—who must have been about Lumley's age.\* They matriculated together at Cambridge in 1549. Moreover Lumley, before he was twenty, married Lord Arundel's daughter. Finally, we know that Arundel, in his will, left all his property to Lord Lumley, in spite of the fact that the Arundel earldom passed to Philip Howard, then Earl of Surrey. These facts have convinced me that the orphan Lumley was brought up in Lord Arundel's household; and from 1540 to 1544 Lord Arundel was Deputy Governor of Calais, that is to say, when Lumley was between the age of eight and twelve.†

\* G.E.C.'s *Complete Peerage* says Lord Maltravers was born in 1538; but this is obviously wrong (a) because his mother died in 1532, and (b) because he passed out of Cambridge in 1549.

† I find in *Records of the Lumleys* that in 1550 Lumley presented Lord Arundel with his MS. translation of Erasmus (Br. Mus. Royal 17, A. 49), which he subscribed "your son, John Lumley." This can only mean one of two things:—

(a) That he married Arundel's daughter before he was eighteen years old; or

5. That he was not employed in the 'eighties.

Lumley fell from power in 1571, and never again held an official position. It is interesting that on June 20, 1583, just about the time he may have been beginning the *Arte*, his cousin, Lord Oxford, who had himself only been restored to Royal favour eighteen days before, wrote thus to his father-in-law, Lord Burghley :—

. . . I have been an earnest suitor unto your Lordship for my Lord Lumley, that it would please you, for my sake, to stand his good lord and friend. . . . For he hath matched with a near kinswoman of mine, to whose father I always was beholden unto. . . . (Lansd. MSS. 38, 62.)

Lord Oxford was well known as a poet and a patron of literature, and the three references made to him in the *Arte* are not without significance :—

And in Her Majesty's time that now is are sprung up another crew of Courtly makers [*i.e.* poets], Noblemen and Gentlemen of Her Majesty's own servants, who have written excellently well as it would appear if their doings could be found out and made known with the rest, of which number is first that noble gentleman Edward, Earl of Oxford. Thomas, Lord Buckhurst, when he was young; Henry, Lord Paget; Sir Philip Sidney; Sir Walter Rawleigh; Master Edward Dyar; Master Fulk Grevell; Gascon; Britton; Turberville, and a great many other learned gentlemen. . . . (Arber, p. 75.)

I have given the quotation in full because Oxford's name at the head of so distinguished a list is, to say the least, striking. The other references to Lord Oxford run thus :—

. . . for Tragedy, the Lord Buckhurst and Master Edward Ferrys do deserve the highest price: the Earl of Oxford and Master Edwards of Her Majesty's Chapel for Comedy and Enterlude (Arber, p. 77).

Edward, Earl of Oxford, a most noble and learned gentleman, made in this figure of response an emblem of Desire, otherwise called Cupid, which for his excellency and wit, I set down some part of the verses, for example (Arber, p. 215).

Although nearly twenty contemporary poets are mentioned by the author of the *Arte*, only four have the distinction of appearing three times, and none more than three times. They are Oxford, Sidney, Raleigh, and Dyer; and of these Oxford heads the list! Is this due

(b) That he was addressing Arundel as his adopted father. Whichever view one takes it strengthens the theory that Lumley was brought up in the Arundel household.

to pure merit, or must we attribute it partly to friendship ?\* In 1590, the year after the *Arte* was published, an inventory taken of Lord Lumley's pictures showed that he possessed a "statuary" (i.e. a full length) portrait of the Earl of Oxford.†

8. That he was educated at Oxford University.

This is the one point in which the evidence seems to be somewhat at variance with Lumley's life ; for in 1549 he graduated at Cambridge. But the fact of his graduation at Cambridge does not preclude the possibility of his having studied at Oxford as well. His friend, Lord Oxford, graduated at both Universities. Besides, we read in the *D.N.B.* that Lumley held the High Stewardship of Oxford University from 1559 till 1609. The actual expression used by the author of the *Arte* is :—

... when I was a scholar at Oxford they called every such one [*i.e.* the figure of speech called Antitheton] Johannes ad oppositum.

I imagine that he must have visited Oxford frequently during his fifty years as High Steward, particularly when he definitely took to literature after his imprisonment and disgrace in 1571. The following note, taken from Surtees' *History of Durham* (vol. ii. p. 158) is of interest :—

The Lord Lumley's library, given by  
his Lordship, Ao. 1585.

There was some struggle about this time between the two Universities for the Lord Lumley's library, noted then for a choice collection of books, for his gift thereof to their libraries, both claiming an interest in him for that purpose ; Cambridge, where he had been once a scholar ; and Oxford, whereof he was High Steward.

As Surtees gives the foregoing in inverted commas it is evidently a quotation, probably from some contemporary chronicler.

14. That he was a friend of Sir John Throckmorton.

We read in the *D.N.B.* that Lord Lumley and Sir Nicholas Throckmorton were arrested and imprisoned together over the

\* As the book somewhat scornfully criticized in the *Arte* for its borrowings from Ronsard and for its French words (ed. Arber, p. 259) is undoubtedly J. Soowthern's *Pandora*, 1584, which was dedicated to the Earl of Oxford, the approval which the author of the *Arte* bestows on the dedication may perhaps be taken as a further sign of his special interest in that nobleman.

† It is perhaps unnecessary to remark that there is not the slightest indication that Oxford knew either of the Puttenham's.

Ridolfi plot. This argues a pretty intimate acquaintance with the Throckmorton family.

This concludes the evidence. We have examined Lord Lumley on the fourteen points postulated for the unknown author of the *Arte* ; but he has so far not only failed to prove a single alibi, and on cross-examination his case would seem to have completely broken down.

Is he guilty or not guilty ?



## THE CANON OF RANDOLPH'S DRAMATIC WORKS

BY G. C. MOORE SMITH

No question can arise as to the authenticity of *Aristippus* and *The Conceited Peddler* ("shows" originally given at Trinity College and printed together in two editions in 1630), *The Jealous Lovers* (acted at Cambridge March 22, 1631/2, and printed 1632), or *The Muses Looking-Glass* and *Amyntas* (both acted by the Revels Company at Salisbury Court Theatre at the end of 1630, the former, if not both, having been already given in the country,\* and each printed in 1638).

It need only be remarked that all these plays had probably been revised before publication.

This is stated of *The Jealous Lovers* (Hazlitt, † p. 63) and we have preserved to us the unrevised text of *Aristippus* (Sloane MS. 2531, f. 124), with a list of Dramatis Personæ in which Medico de Campo is definitely identified with Dick Lichfeild, the Barber-surgeon of Cambridge, ‡ and with some political allusions, as one to Gondomar, which were afterwards omitted. *The Muses Looking-Glass* had probably been produced at Trinity before it was taken over by the Revels Company, and some of the scenes we have were perhaps written after the original performance.

It is also noticeable that *The Jealous Lovers* and *Amyntas* have some lines in common.

Dr. Parry § pointed out that in *The Jealous Lovers* (H, p. 105) we have :

By the same womb that bred us, and the breasts  
Of our dead mother Lalage.

\* Mr. W. J. Lawrence in *The Times Literary Supplement*, November 29, 1923.

† *Poetical and Dramatic Works of T. Randolph*, ed. W. C. Hazlitt, 1875.

‡ The presumed author of *The Trimming of Thomas Nashe*, 1597.

§ *The Poems and Amyntas of Thomas Randolph*, edited by J. J. Parry, Newhaven [U.S.A.] : Yale University Press ; London : H. Milford, 1917, p. 373.

and in *Amyntas* (H, p. 345) :

And by the womb that bare thee, by the breasts  
Of thy dead mother Lalage.

Similarly *J.L.* (H, p. 112) :

By one favour  
Cut forty years away from the gray sum.

and *Amyntas* (H, p. 370) :

This spring of joy  
Cuts forty years away from the gray sum.

Two plays only present a problem, *Hey for Honesty*, translated out of Aristophanes his *Plutus*, by Tho. Randolph. Augmented and Published by F. J. 1651, and the Latin comedy *Cornelianum Dolium*, 1638.

But we have also to consider the question of Randolph's authorship of the *Præludium* printed by Dr. Parry from Add. MS. 15227, and of the share he had in *The Careles Shepherdess*, "by T. G. M<sup>r</sup> of Arts," printed in 1656.

# I.

As for *Hey for Honesty*, in spite of insertions by F. J. on almost every page, there can be no doubt that the substratum is Randolph's work. Cp. the Welshman's pedigree, III. i. p. 432, with the *Oratio Prævaricatoria*, p. 674, notice the form "snort" = "snore," so constant in Randolph, the references p. 447 to "Middletons silver" (*A Character*, p. 637), and "Aristotles well" (*Aristippus*, p. 6, *A Character*, p. 637), p. 456 to "Sir Giles Mompesson in the persecution of innocent tapsters" (*Aristippus*, p. 16, "I could love Sir Giles for presenting those notorious ale wives"), p. 467 to "Mezentius' tyranny" (*In Lesbiam*, p. 540, "Mezentius' bloody cruelty"), p. 473, "she sticks to him as close as a cockle" (*Jealous Lovers*, p. 108, "closer than cockles," and *An Epithalamium*, p. 552), p. 480 "Terra del Fogos" (*To Mr. J. Shirley*, p. 648), p. 482 "so slender that I can measure me by my own yard" (*Petition to his Creditors*, p. 635, "One . . . more slender than the yard he measures by"), p. 489 "delightas" (*Aristippus*, p. 25, "my delight-a").

Nor is there any doubt that *Hey for Honesty* like *Aristippus* and *The Peddler* was written to be acted as a "show" at Cambridge. Cp. Introduction, p. 383 : "We meant it but a show ; if more it

be | Your kind acceptance christens it Comedy" (cp. Carion's speech, p. 481); p. 390, "carry him to the top of the castle-hill" (a local allusion); Carion's song, p. 451, "Garret Ostle Bridge was down" (Cooper, *Annals of Cambridge*, iii. p. 198, writes that "At the Assizes held in the Castle on March 13, 1626/7 the inhabitants of Cambridge were indicted for the non-repair of Garret Hostel Bridge, which was soon afterwards repaired at the expense of the Corporation"), p. 485, "At the Pope's Head, Mitre, or Cardinal's Cap" (Cambridge inns).

Randolph's schoolfellow, William Hemminge, is probably referring to the ridicule of Puritans in *Hey for Honesty* when in his *Elegy on Randolph's Finger*, l. 193 \* (c. 1631), he makes Puritans indignant because :

His sarsnett hood  
So vilye wrote against the Brotherhood,

going on, as Mr. W. J. Lawrence has shown,<sup>†</sup> to refer to *The Muses' Looking-Glass*, acted at Salisbury Court by the Revels Boys late in 1630 :

And w<sup>th</sup> was worse that lately he did pen  
Vyle thinges for pigmeys gaynst the Sonns of men.

## II.

The play *Cornelianum Dolium* has the following title-page :  
CORNELIANUM DOLIUM. Comœdia lepidissima, optimorum iudiciis  
approbata, & Theatrali coryphæo, nec immeritò, donata, palma choralì  
apprimè digna. Auctore T.R. ingeniosissimo hujus ævi Heliconio.  
Londini, Apud Tho. Harperum. . . . 1638.

This dedication follows :

*Spectatissimo Viro, Alexandro Radcliffe, Baiensi Militi ; Musis  
grato, Suis charo, Alienis benigno, Omnibus benevolo ;* POSTHUMUS  
VATES *Hanc opellam in extremam observantiæ suæ memoriam,  
Candidè, conditè, cordatè ; intimè, integrè, intemeratè ; dedit, dicavit,  
dedicavit.*

There can be no doubt that by "T.R." and "Posthumus Vates" the reader was to understand Randolph. But even supposing that this attribution is correct, everything else is

\* I quote from my edition published at the Shakespeare Head Press, Stratford-upon-Avon, 1923.

† *Times Lit. Sup.*, July 24, 1924.

left in obscurity. Was the play ever acted, and if so, where and when? How can a comedy, mainly in prose, be said to be "palma choralis apprimè digna"? What meaning are we to attach to the words "Theatrali coryphæo, nec immeritò, donata"?

Meanwhile, Mr. J. Crossley has argued that the play was written by Richard Braithwait, and so even the question of authorship is left in doubt.

There is fortunately no doubt as to the identity of Sir Alexander Radcliffe, K.B., to whom the play was dedicated.

By help of Burke's *Landed Gentry* we can identify him with Sir Alexander Radclyffe of Ordsall, co. Lancs (close to Manchester), who was born April 27, 1608, as son of Sir John Radclyffe of Ordsall and Alice, daughter of Sir John Byron of Newstead. According to Burke, he married Jane Radclyffe, natural daughter of Robert, 5th Earl of Sussex, while the marriage licence granted by the Bishop of London (*Harl. Society's Publ.* XXVI.) is thus worded:

1623, June 4. Alexander Radclyffe, Bachelor, 15, son of Sir John Radclyffe, Kt., and Jane Shute, Spinster, 13, daughter of Edward Shute, esq., deceased: consent of her mother Frances Shute, widow, of St. James, Clerkenwell, Middlesex, at St. James, Clerkenwell, aforesaid.

G.E.C.'s peerage shows that the Earl of Sussex married Mrs. Shute a few days after the marriage of Jane Shute to Radcliffe; but though the Earl is said to have had children by Mrs. Shute before marriage, the editor, on the basis of the marriage licence quoted above, considers Jane to have been the daughter of Edward Shute. In Lord Sussex's will,\* made when his legitimate children were dead, he leaves £50 to "my daughter Ratcliffe, to buie her a ringe," but we cannot from this deduce his paternity, as he may have meant "my stepdaughter Ratcliffe." After the death of Lady Sussex, administration of her goods was given January 17, 1627/8, to her husband, and after his death, September 22, 1629, on January 18, 1629/30 to "Sir Alexander Radcliffe, K.B., and Dame Jane his wife, only daughter of the deceased."

Alexander Radcliffe was among those created Knights of the Bath on February 2, 1625/6, in connexion with King Charles' coronation. His father, Sir John Radcliffe, was slain in the Isle of Rhé in 1627, when Sir Alexander succeeded to the estates.

If Thomas Randolph can be credited with the Dedication, one

\* Ridley 86, made August 15, proved October 8, 1629.

might suggest that he was introduced to the Radcliffes either by Ben Jonson, who had celebrated Sir John Radcliffe (Epigram 93) :

Than whom I do not know a whiter soul,  
Nor could I, had I seen all Nature's roll,

and Margaret Radcliffe, Sir John's sister (?) (Epigram 40) :

Earth, thou hast not such another,

or by the Hattons, who were Lady Radcliffe's cousins. The Shutes had been settled close to the Hattons at Oakington, near Cambridge, and Edward Shute's sister Jane had married John Hatton of the next village of Long Stanton,\* and so become the mother of Sir Christopher, Sir Robert, and Sir Thomas Hatton, and the grandmother of Randolph's friend Sir Christopher Hatton of Kirby—afterwards Baron Hatton. However, we shall see that it is hardly necessary to insist on these links.

To turn to the play. The scene is laid in Genoa and such references to Italian life and customs as are found in it may be due to a mere attempt at local colour. On the other hand, they may point to the play's being based on some Italian original.

Thus the form used for a hospital is "Lazarello" or "Lazarella," p. 12, etc. (but not "Lazaretto" as one would expect); on p. 19 "Virginis" (the Virgin Mary's) is contrasted with "Veneris"; on p. 59 we have a reference to public penance in the streets and to a mountebank quack "Johannes Babtista succa"; on p. 117, Opilio, a married vicar of purely English type, offers to make the school-master his chaplain "de ordine Prædicatorum"—a seeming allusion to the order of Preaching Friars, and an oration is to be given "in publicis rostris"; on p. 119 we have the anthem "De Profundis" sung after a man's death; on p. 128, "prope Theomantii porticum" in the church where the man is buried, sounds like a reference to a particular church at Genoa.

But leaving the question open, whether the play had some Italian source, is it Randolph who designed or wrote the Latin play before us?

Indications of Randolph's authorship are not so obvious as one would expect. The play has hardly any allusions to Cambridge or academic life. The only University mentioned is "Oxonja,"

\* See Morant's *Essex*, II. p. 22. Lady Sussex's first husband is here given as Francis, not Edward Shute. It seems likely that there is an error of a generation.

p. 9. Perhaps the only Cambridge allusion is contained in the use of "Fucus" as the name of a hypocrite, pp. 100, 110, which probably goes back to the play *Fucus* acted at Queens' College in 1622/3, a year before Randolph joined the University. Randolph alludes to the play both in *The Muses' Looking-Glass*, v. 1, where the Puritan Bird says, "No dance is lawful | But prinkum-prankum," and in the *Oratio Prævaricatoria* (*ad fin.*), where it is said: "Ignavum Fucus pecus est, petit illico lucos; | Et factus blancum non saltat prinkum prankum!" The author of *Fucus*, Robert Ward, was, from 1629, Vicar of Oakington—the home of some of the Hattons—and was probably known to Randolph personally.

The burlesque of the language of a proclamation which opens the Preface of the play: "Noverint universi per præsentem me Cornelianum," is common in Randolph. Thus *Aristippus* (Hazlitt, p. 11): "*Arist.* . . . noverint universi—*Sim.* Per præsentem me Simplicium . . ."; *Peddler* (p. 45): "They are . . . fringed with *noverint universi*"; *Hey for Honesty* (p. 465): "*Noverint universi per præsentem*, your lawyer is a coxcomb."

But the jocose use of the legal formula is common enough outside Randolph.

Much more striking is the fact that two *motifs* of the play are also employed in the *Jealous Lovers*. In the first place, in both plays we have an echo of the Gravedigger Scene in *Hamlet*. In *Corn. Dolium*, v. 2 (p. 118), a gravedigger sings a song at his task, and when asked for whom he is making the grave, answers sententiously: "Illi struo, qui erat quod non est, et est quod non erat, nec in futurum erit." In *Jealous Lovers*, iv. 3 (Hazlitt, p. 137), the Sexton moralises over the skulls he throws up: "This was a captain's skull. . . ." "This was a poetical noddle. . . ." "This was the prime madam in Thebes. . . ."

This is followed by a *motif*, which goes back to Boccaccio's 5th Novella of the 2nd Day, that of the violation of a tomb or coffin by robbers who are terror-stricken when the supposed corpse rises before them. In *Corn. Dolium* two robbers enter the church in which Cornelius has been laid and remove the stones covering his coffin. He rises on his feet and they cry "A spectre! a spectre!" and rush away distracted. In *Jealous Lovers* the Sexton and his wife agree to strip the bodies of Tyndarus and Techmessa. The latter rise from their coffins and the intending robbers swoon.

Much of *Cornelianum Dolium*, the part which deals with the legacy-



hunters, their gifts to the rascally servant Grinchamus, who persuades each that he is sole heir, Prunella's offer of an electuary (cp. Corbaccio's opiate), the amusement that Cornelius finds in the situation, and the final overturning of all expectations, including those of Grinchamus and his fellow-servants, by Cornelius' return to health—is clearly suggested by Jonson's *Volpone*. And no one was more likely than Randolph to borrow from Jonson. He had borrowed from the *Alchemist* in his fairy-scenes in *Amyntas*.

Even if it proved true that *Corn. Dolium* rested on an Italian foundation, that would not go against Randolph's authorship. Miss V. M. Jeffery has shown in *Modern Language Review*, XIX. pp. 442-4, that Randolph borrowed from earlier Italian pastorals when he wrote *Amyntas*.

If this was all we had before us we might say that internal evidence gave support to the ascription of the play to Randolph, made by the original editor and accepted by Aubrey, who got most of his information about Randolph from Randolph's brother John. There is, however, another side to the question.

In *Notes and Queries*, ser. 2, vol. xii. p. 441, the late Mr. James Crossley gave grounds for believing *Corn. Dolium* to be the work of Richard Braithwait. Some may perhaps be disregarded. He showed, however, that Harper who printed the play had printed Braithwait's *Arcadian Princess* in 1635, that Braithwait had dedicated his *Whimzies* (by "Clitus Alexandrinus") in 1631 to Sir Alexander Radcliffe, possibly also his *Barnabæ Itinerarium* (by "Corymbæus") (it was dedicated to "Royal Alexander"), that the words "candidè, conditè, cordatè," found in the dedication of the play are also found in the dedication of the second part of Braithwait's *Essays on the Five Senses* (by "Multibibus"), that the riming introduction to the "Errata" of the play:

Corneliani sit amoris  
Hos corrigere errores  
Preli præli vitæ voti  
Vos Errores valetote

recall the similar lines in Barnaby's *Journey*:

Spectans ista typis data  
Hoc composui errata  
Inter Barnabæ errores  
Hi mutârunt preli mores:

that the riming Latin verses found on pp. 68, 71, 118, 121, 131, 132 of the play are in the style of Barnaby; finally, that Braithwait

mentions Cornelius' tub in his *Law of Drinking*, 1617, p. 74, in which Cornelius (Vandunk) is a leading character.

In the passage last mentioned, as his drunken companions carry him home "they cling close about Cornelius' bulk, till sleepe surprize them . . . and brave Cornelius guide them to his tub, where we leave him to such as love him and would live with him." The passage may be illustrated by *Whimzies*, p. 120 :

By this our Cornelius is become Tacitus since hee dropt into his bathing tubbe, where hee left his haire, and lost his honour : since which time he is quite falne off from his zealous brethrens favour : for the dampe of his life hath so darkened the light of his doctrine, as now for want of audience hee may save himselfe a labour.

I was at first uncertain if the tub here mentioned was that in use for the venereal disease. Probably Mr. Crossley is right. But it is still the fact that the Cornelius of *Corn. Dolium* is neither a drunkard nor an Amsterdam preacher, and Braithwait's drunken Cornelius is not elsewhere described as a whoremonger—so that the two characters have little in common.

I can, however, support Mr. Crossley's case by adducing some further points in *Corn. Dolium* which suggest Braithwait.

Braithwait says of an ostler, *Whimzies*, p. 14 :

Some . . . gripes of mortalitie he feeles which makes him conclude . . . Grasse and hay, we are all mortall.

The parson Opilio in *Corn. Dolium* says (p. 88) : "Seges & flos segetis : omnes sumus mortales." Cornelius predicts that Opilio will say so again (p. 99) : "Fœnum & flos fœni, prædicabit Opilio." And Opilio does so. "Fœnum & flos fœni : omnes mortales sumus" (p. 106). "O fœnum & flos fœni" (p. 107). "Fœnum & flos fœni ; omnes mortales sumus" (p. 114).\*

Again in *Whimzies*, p. 41, it is said of a gamester :

Surely he would expresse himselfe a second Margites of whom it is said that hee never plowed nor digged nor addressed himselfe to ought all his life long that might tend unto goodnesse, being wholly unprofitable to the world.

And in *Essayes upon The Five Senses—A Continuation* (1635) this is repeated (p. 290) :

These Margites-like of whom it is said that hee never plowed, nor digged, nor did any thing all his life long that might tend to any goodnesse, are wholly unprofitable unto the world.

\* See, however, note on p. 323 below.

So in *Corn. Dolium*, p. 110 :

*Grin.* Quem sibi locum sepulturæ [Cornelius] elegerit? *Per.* Prope Margitis tumbam. *Grin.* Pari fuerunt consortio viventes & in uno condendi tumulto morientes. *Per.* Nostine Margitem eum? *Grin.* Nimis novi: Per totum Orbem nil infructuosius inveniri poterit. Aliorum laboribus (Fuci instar) viveret; in obitum usque nil boni unquam fecerit.

Again, if Braithwait wrote the Dedication, and the formula "candidè, conditè, cordatè" seems decisive on the point, his curious translation of "Knight of the Bath" by "Baïensi Militi," instead of "Equiti De Balneo," deserves special notice because in the play itself the town of Bath is represented by "Baia." At p. 10 Grinchamus, who is ill, says, "Nunc ad Baias procederem, sed ne in Lectica quidem obequitare valeo," while on p. 19 we have "Æstivis Baiis [the hot baths] in Somersetensi Comitatu." If Braithwait wrote the Dedication, he also presumably wrote these sentences of the play.

Once more in *Whimzies* we are told of "A Zealous Neighbour" that "he would pawn his estate for those two rings of Giges and Hans Carvile." *Corn. Dolium* (p. 131) has "spatiati sumus | Sine Principis annulo Gygis."

An allusion of a rather questionable kind in *Corn. Dolium*, p. 21 : where a lord takes a woman every day in his coach to the theatre "ubi opaciores loculos | Semper eligerent, quò *Centipede* liberiùs | Utantur mutuò," is paralleled in *Barnaby*, Pt. III. :

Veni Newton in Salictis  
Ubi ludens chartis pictis  
Cum puella speciosa  
Cujus nomen erat Rosa  
Centi-pede provocavi  
Ad amandum quam amavi.

Thence to Newton in the Willows,  
Where being bolster'd up with pillows,  
I at cards played with a girl,  
Rose by name, a dainty pearl:  
At centy-foot I often moved  
Her to love me, whom I loved.

The editors of the *New Oxford Dictionary* have had too much modesty to explain "centy-foot."

What conclusions can be drawn from this evidence?

The printer's attribution of the play to Randolph cannot be dismissed—especially as the volume is dedicated to a man in high position like Sir Alexander Radcliffe. It cannot be supposed that he would lend his name to a fraudulent attribution. It would seem probable that Randolph at least drafted the play if he did not sketch the contents of the different scenes. We are told indeed that Braithwait after arriving in London shortly before 1610 "devoted

himself to poetry and dramatic writing" (*D.N.B.*), though any plays that he then wrote are lost. Randolph, however, was a practised dramatist, and the delightful character studies and quick movement of *Cornelianum Dolium*, along with its imitation of *Volpone* and its links with *The Jealous Lovers* point to his hand. Perhaps the play as he left it (perhaps before he had written *The Jealous Lovers*) was in English: one would rather hope so from the character of the Latin. At any rate at some stage Braithwait appears to have taken it over. The reference (p. 102) to Gerard's new Herball shows that he had not completed it before 1633. It was he to all appearance who dedicated it in Randolph's name to his own patron Sir Alexander Radcliffe, commissioned Marshall to execute such an engraving for it as he had previously executed for some of Braithwait's own books,\* and sent it to Harper who had printed his own *Arcadian Princess*.

Had the play meanwhile been acted? and if so, where? The statement that it was "*Theatrali coryphæo nec immerito donata*" (? "presented to the coryphæus of the theatre"), if it refers to Radcliffe, the only man to whom we know the play to have been presented, suggests that it had been written to be acted by some company, perhaps of private friends, under Radcliffe's direction, and presumably at his house. Radcliffe is described by Braithwait in the dedication of *Whimzies* as both a knight and a scholar.

The words of the Prologue:

Egredimur Silvis, altiora Musis  
Sectando Latias. Invideant Vates  
Prisci nostratūm lepidos conatus

seem to imply that wherever the play was given, Latin plays of a pastoral kind had been given before.

But from the later lines:

Spectate candidi & inter Actus frangite  
Nuces, & Indicum propinate fumum,  
Si placet, Amicas deprimate basiolis,

it seems clear that the play was not given in a school or college at Oxford or Cambridge, while a play in Latin can hardly have been given in a public theatre.

One cannot, however, overlook the fact that the interest of the play is largely medical. We have a reference to the Hot Baths of Bath, to Surgeon's Hall ("Tota Chirurgorum Aula hanc nobis libertatem concessit," Act III. sc. 3), and to the College of Physicians

\* *Essays on the Five Senses*, 1635.

(" si Collegium Doctorum te deprehensum minus viderint, peste plures quàm brevi spatio interficias," Act IV. sc. 6). Both these latter references are complimentary. We have the recital of Hippocrates' eight rules of health and of the precept of the *Schola Salernitana* against living in an unwholesome air (Act. IV. sc. 5). We have a list of medical authorities including the new (1633) edition of Gerard's *Herball*. Although in Syringius we have an ignorant surgeon satirized, the only character in the piece who is represented as able and admirable is the physician from Naples, Peregrinus.

It suggested itself to me that the play was perhaps written to be performed before the College of Physicians. But this theory leaves "Theatrali coryphæo" unexplained; and it involves us in the supposition that pastoral plays had also been given before the College. Lastly, I am kindly informed by Sir Humphry Rolleston, President of the Royal College, and by Mr. Arnold Amplin, Harveian Librarian, that there are no records of plays having been given in the College.

### III.

I now come to *Praeludium*, printed by Dr. Parry, p. 226, preserved, it would seem in the author's hand, in Add. MS. 37,425 and attested—as stated, by Lord Chancellor Clarendon—"T. Randall after the last Plague" (not "Prologue" as Parry gives it). It is hard to see why Dr. Parry hesitates to accept this as Randolph's work and prefers the very strange hypothesis that it was "written by some one else for a performance of one of Randolph's plays, given in all probability subsequent to the closing of the theatres."

Yet he himself points out links between the *Praeludium* and genuine works of Randolph. These seem to me convincing evidence of Randolph's authorship. In the time of plague, it is said that actors were in sore straits: "Many have peeped into roomes like fidlers, 'Gentlemen will you have any speeches?' " In *The Jealous Lovers*, III. 5 (Hazlitt, p. 120), Asotus addressing the poets Bomolochus and Charylus says:

I will not have you henceforth sneak to taverns  
And peep like fiddlers into gentlemen's rooms  
To shark for wine and radishes.

Again, the actor says:

'twas a Lent with us & I believe an Ember weeke with some of you; when you have kept your Frydayes two or three days together.

In *Hey for Honesty*, IV. 1 (Hazlitt, p. 453) we have :

Necessity | . . . makes thy teeth observe | Unconscionable Fridays, profane  
fasting-days, | With Lent and antichristian Ember weeks.

Once more the lady Lover cries (p. 229) :

What Tyger

Leopard or Lyonesse suckled you with blood . . . .

which recalls *Amyntas* (Parry, p. 319) :

What barbarous Tigers issue, what cursed whelp  
Of Beares or Lyon had the marble heart, etc.

Since this was written Dr. Greg informs me that the MS. of the *Prælude* has the signs of an author's MS., and that having compared it with the two signatures of Randolph given in facsimile by Hazlitt, he sees no reason why the hand should not be Randolph's, and some slight indication that it may be.

For whatever play it was designed, this *Prælude*, I have no doubt, was written by Randolph. The word itself is characteristic of him, though also used by others. *Aristippus* has its *Prælude*.

#### IV.

We have finally to consider whether Randolph had any hand in the play printed in 1656 with the title, *The Careles Shepherdess. A Tragi-Comedy Acted before the King & Queen, And at Salisbury Court, with great Applause. Written by T. G. M<sup>r</sup> of Arts.*

Mr. W. J. Lawrence (*Times Literary Supplement*, July 24, 1924) pointed to the curious verbal coincidences in the epilogue of this play and those of Randolph's *Amyntas* and *Muses' Looking-Glass*, which plays he had previously shown were acted at Salisbury Court at the end of 1630. The epilogue of the *Careles Shepherdess* begins "Ladies and gentle youths," and has later : "when he sees a constellation rise | Shot from the glorious light of severall eyes | That gild the Orbe." In the epilogue of *Amyntas* we have : "Would every lady in this orbe might see | Their loves as happy as we say they be | And for you gentle youths, etc." ; that of *Muses' Looking-Glass* begins : "Y<sup>e</sup> have seen the Muses Looking Glasse, Ladyes fair | And Gentle youths ; and others too who ere | Have fill'd this orbe." There can be little doubt that the three epilogues came from the same pen.



Mr. Lawrence goes on to say that neither a Court nor a theatre audience could be addressed as "Ladies and gentle youths"; that the only audience that could be so addressed would be a university or school gathering, and that the three epilogues must have been written for performances at Cambridge. To me it seems that the address is most unsuitable for an audience in a college hall, in which ladies, if they were present at all, would count for very little. We know the three plays were all acted at Salisbury Court, and with great deference for Mr. Lawrence's weighty opinion, I hold that it was for Salisbury Court that the epilogues were composed. That Randolph was the author in each case there can be little doubt.

Cp. this epilogue to *The Careles Shepherdess* :

When he sees a Constellation rise  
Shot from the glorious light of severall eyes  
That gild the Orbe

with Randolph's lines in *An Elegy* (p. 596) :

Those your glorious eyes  
Whence I was wont to see my day-star rise  
. . . she alone sits there,  
Sole angel of that orb.

The word "Shot" in the above passage is itself characteristic :  
Cp. *Character of a Perfect Woman* (Parry, p. 221) :

Beames that shoote glory forth,  
p. 222,  
To a friend if curtesie graunt a kisse  
'Tis frost in hers, yet lightning shot from his.

*Ad Amicam* (Parry, p. 224) :

Those flaming beames, shott from thine eye.

Cp. also Epilogue to *Careles Shepherdess* :

One eye to view this Goblin that<sup>spare</sup>d with hair . . .  
He does presume you softer sex will scan  
Some walking Cottage wrong'd you, not a man,

with *In Praise of Women* (H, 646) :

Virtue, sure,  
Were blind as fortune, should she choose the poor  
Rough cottage, man, to live in, and despise  
To dwell in you.

If Randolph, as Fleay suggested, was manager or sub-manager of Salisbury Court Theatre from the spring of 1632 to that of 1633,

he may well have written the Epilogue for the production of "T. G."’s play.

What, then, of the Præludium (a favourite word with Randolph, as we have seen) the Prologue (for a revival of the play) and the Prologue at Whitehall?

The last is linked to the Epilogue by the unusual form "Silvian" (= "Sylvian"), and may well also be Randolph’s writing.

The Præludium has some phrases which remind one of Randolph’s lines (H, p. 536):

any Inns of Court man that hath gone  
To buy an Ovid with a Littleton.

The Prologue has the same apology for not giving "high lines," which we find in the Prologue to *Amyntas*. But neither, though the Præludium has some sparkle, seems to have the distinction of Randolph’s writing. Moreover, the Prologue seems to allude to R. Brome’s *Antipodes* (1638), and the Præludium has an echo of Brome.

Cp. Brome’s *Court Beggar*, 1653, N. 5 v.:

A tissue Doublet; and a Ribband shop  
Hung in his Hatbands, might set up a Pedler.

with Præludium:

If you would bring a fashion up  
And hang some Ribboning round about your Hat  
As well as in one place, you should finde me  
And my Wife thankfull. *Spru.* "Twould be too Pedlar-like.

Mr. Lawrence informs me that:

From 1635-1638 Brome was the articulated dramatist to Salisbury Court Theatre, receiving 15s. a week and a benefit, and contracting to deliver three plays per year. Within that period he also supplied the company with sundry prologues and epilogues and songs. In August 1638 he renewed the agreement at an advance of salary . . . but a rupture took place about the early summer of 1639.

He adds:

I believe it was shortly before the rupture that Salisbury Court revived *The Careles Shepherdess*, and that Brome wrote the Præludium and the Prologue. Both have marks of his style and trend of thought.

At the same time if he "scrapped" an earlier Præludium and Prologue written by Randolph, he may have kept a few phrases from

them, as well as the whole of Randolph's Epilogue and Prologue at Whitehall. The last had of course to stand as it had been written.

As to the author of the play "T. G., M<sup>r</sup> of Arts," all we can say is that he cannot be Thomas Goffe with whom Langbaine and later historians have identified him, that is, if we are to trust the Prologue written for the play's revival which speaks of the author as still alive. Goffe died in 1629 before Salisbury Court was opened.\*

The result of the investigation is this, that I claim for Randolph the Prologue at Whitehall and the Epilogue, leaving to Brome the Prælude and the Prologue, and the play itself to an unknown "T. G."

## V.

One play of Randolph's, if it was really his, has disappeared, viz. *The Prodigall Scholar*, entered in the Stationers' Register by Humphrey Moseley, June 29, 1660, as "A Comedy by Tho. Randall."

\* The entry in the Stationers' Register on 22 Oct. 1655, describes it, however, as "by Thomas Gough, M<sup>r</sup> of Arts," so the attribution is much older than Langbaine. I owe this information to Dr. Greg.

[Note to p. 316].—Mr. W. J. Lawrence reminds me that "Grass and hay! we are all mortall; let's live till we die and be merry" is a catch-phrase used repeatedly by the Priest, Sir John, in *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* (printed 1608 and referred to in 1604). The use of the phrase in Braithwaite's *Whimzies* and in *Corn. Dolium* may both then (perhaps independently) go back to the unknown author of *The Merry Devil*. It should be added that the *Merry Devil* is referred to (presumably by Randolph) in *Hey for Honesty* (H, p. 412).

## SOME NOTES ON DRYDEN \*

By G. THORN-DRURY

### ix. *The Medal.*

*The Medal* was in public circulation on March 16, 1682. This fact is established by the endorsement which Luttrell, *more suo*, put upon his copy,† acquired, as the letter below tends to show, either on the date of issue or immediately after it. According to a priest in later years often to be met at Mr. Pope's, it was Charles II. who suggested the subject to Dryden,‡ and it certainly seems that people generally were aware that such a piece was being written, and that the publication of it was awaited with some interest and impatience. Lenthall Warcup or Warcup, a member of a well-known Oxfordshire family and afterwards an officer in the Guards, writes as follows in a letter, now in my possession, which, in view of its brevity, I venture to quote at length.

Wensday, March 15th.

HONORED FATHER,

Since your departure there is but little news here, all the expectation is for the Dukes coming to Towne, yet there are abundance gone to waite vpon him att Newmarkett. I mett S<sup>r</sup> James Butler two days agoe he told me the Duke of Ormond would be in England within a month att farthest and then if you had any intention to dispose of me that way he woud give all the assistance he cou'd. wee expect the Poem vpon my Lord S. Meddall to come out this morning, if I can get it before the Carrier goes ile certainly send it now, otherwise next weeke. My Lady Lenthall & her son are quite broke soe the Law must decide. I hope my mother & the whole family are well. soe I remain

Your most obedient son,

LEN. WARCUPP.

Endorsed upon the outside

For/

Edmond Warcupp Esq. §  
att Northmore  
in  
Oxfordshire.  
present.

\* Continued from p. 197.

† *The Critical and Miscellaneous Prose Works of John Dryden*, 1800, I. i. 163.

‡ Spence's *Anecdotes*, 1820, 171-2.

§ This gentleman was, I suppose, the magistrate who was always taking informations about the Popish Plot.

x. *Dryden Prologues and Epilogues in Sir W. Haward's MS.*

In a large folio MS. book, containing some seven hundred pages, which was compiled by Sir William Haward,\* there appear (pp. 248-9) the *Prologue to the first part of y<sup>e</sup> Conquest of Granada, spoken by Mohun*, and the *Epilogue to the second part of the Seige of Granada, spoken by Hart*.

By a slip the words *first* and *second* have been interchanged. Both pieces are interesting; the Prologue, besides verbal variations, has after l. 10 the following passage which has not, I think, been previously printed:

Some of them seeme indeed y<sup>e</sup> Poetts freinds,  
But 'tis as France courts England for her ends.  
They build up this Lampoone, & th' other songe,  
And Court him to lye still, while they grow stronge.

The Epilogue adds nothing to the printed version, but it is well worthy of remark that there are three couplets, ll. 23-4, 31-2 and 36-7, to each of which is appended the note, "not spoke," while in l. 32 "were" appears, as I venture to think rightly, instead of "are."

On pp. 463-4 are the *prologue to y<sup>e</sup> Play of Amboyna* and *The Epilogue*. Both of them differ in details from the printed text (e.g. in the Prologue the MS. has in l. 33, "Nor hope for Witt in Dutch men," and in the Epilogue, l. 21, "English Catoes" for "loyal English"), and the Prologue, while omitting ll. 19-20, has an additional couplet after l. 16:—

One would have thought you should have growne more wise  
Then to be caught with y<sup>e</sup> same bargaine twice.

The *Epilogue to S<sup>r</sup> Fopling Flutter, the play made by M<sup>r</sup> Etheridge* is entered on pp. 558-9. The MS. version has "it" for "they" in l. 6; and "I (i.e. Ay) now mee thinkes" for "I vow methinks" in l. 10, readings which I submit are worthy of serious consideration: it confirms in l. 14 the "file" of the 1676 4to, represented in Scott and Saintsbury by the word "fill," and supplies immediately after this line, an unprinted couplet—

Labour to put in more, as Master Bayes  
Thrumms in Additions to his ten-yeares plays.

\* "Sir William Hayward (*sic*) of Tandridge hall in Com. Surry Knt, g<sup>t</sup> in ordinary of ye ho<sup>us</sup> privy Chamber to King Charles ye first and King Charles ye 2<sup>d</sup>." —*The Visitation of Surrey*, 1662-8, Harl. Soc., 1910, 58.

The MS. is now in the possession of Messrs. Dobell of Bruton St., W., who have kindly allowed me to make use of it for the purposes of this note.

If it is thought unlikely that Dryden would thus himself introduce the name of Bayes, it should be remembered that in *The Vindication*, 1683, p. 22, he says: "Much less am I concerned at the noble name of *Bayes*; that's a *Brat* so like his own *Father*, that he cannot be mistaken for any other body": and in the dedication of his *Juvenal*, 1693, "I answered not the *Rehearsal*, because I knew the author sat to himself, when he drew the picture, and was the very *Bayes* of his own *Farce*."

#### xi. *Absalom and Achitophel*.

Scott and other commentators have pointed out that the application of the Scripture story of Absalom and Achitophel to the contemporary political situation is not originally due to Dryden, and reference has been made to *Absalom's Conspiracy; or the Tragedy of Treason, A Letter to His Grace the Duke of Monmouth . . . , The Badger in the Fox-trap* and *Sir Barnaby Whigg*.

The following extracts go to confirm the view that such a parallel was generally familiar some considerable time before November 17, 1681, which, on the strength of Luttrell's inscription,\* is believed to have been the date of the publication of the poem.

In *Malice Defeated: Or a Brief Relation of the Accusation and Deliverance of Elizabeth Cellier . . .* 1680, fol., on p. 31 occurs this passage:

"And as to my own Sex, I hope they will pardon the Errors of my Story, as well as those bold Attempts of mine that occasion'd it, since in what I meddled with, as to Sir *Robert Peyton*, and others (that are yet among them undiscovered like *Hushai*, and I hope will have as good success to confound the crafty Contrivances of all the old *Achitophels* and the *Headstrong Ambitious Practices of young Absalom*) though it may be thought too masculine, yet was it the effects of my Loyal (more than Religious) Zeal to gain Proselytes to his Service."

This is referred to in one of the answers to Mrs. Cellier, *Modesty Triumphant over Impudence: Or Some Notes Upon a Late Romance . . .* 1680, fol. p. 14, in these terms, "When she hath . . . told another idle tale of the Earl of *Shaftsbury* and his Nephew . . . foisted in impertinent fopperies of *Achitophels*, *Absaloms*, of Sir *R. Peiton* transformed into *Hushai*, . . . she goes on to her Trial."

It is perhaps worth notice, that in the last-mentioned tract

\* *The Critical and Miscellaneous Prose Works of John Dryden*, 1800, I. i. 157.



Mrs. Cellier is said to have been assisted in her *Relation* by the unfortunate Matthew Medbourn and the still more unfortunate Henry Nevil, *alias* Paine, both of them playwrights and the former a player as well.

xii. *Dryden and the opera on The Tempest.*

Mr. W. J. Lawrence, for whose conclusions on any such matter I have, if I may be allowed to say so, the most profound respect, is satisfied that Shadwell wrote an opera on *The Tempest* which was produced at the Dorset Garden Theatre *circa* April 30, 1674.\* It is obviously impossible in a detached note such as this to set out in full detail either Mr. Lawrence's careful and elaborate statement of his case, or even one's own doubts, and therefore I offer beforehand an apology for what may appear "quaint and magisterial" in what I have to say.

I think one is justified in saying that the main grounds upon which Mr. Lawrence relies are :

- (a) Downes's statement that "*The Tempest* . . . made into an opera by Mr. Shadwell" was produced in 1673. (Mr. Lawrence, as I have indicated, does not accept this date.)
- (b) The presence in *The Tempest*, ed. 1674, of a song the words of which are known to be Shadwell's.
- (c) The existence of a Prologue and Epilogue to *y<sup>e</sup> Tempest* † which upon internal evidence he decides "were undoubtedly written by Shadwell for his own opera."

If we are intended to understand, as Mr. Lawrence's language leaves us no room to doubt that we are, that after Davenant's and Dryden's horrible dealing with *The Tempest*, Shadwell found it still essentially a comedy, and turned it into an opera, then there is, in my view, some considerable doubt about the matter.

Mr. Lawrence is well aware of the unreliable character of Downes's evidence, but I think he does the old Prompter more than justice when he says that the events which he relates mostly took place, but seldom in the sequence indicated.

In this particular instance what strikes one at once is that if he knew that Shadwell had turned *The Tempest* into an opera with a

\* *The Elizabethan Playhouse And Other Studies*, 1912, 193-206.

† Egerton MS. 2, 623 : printed, incorrectly by the way, *op. cit.* 200-2.

conspicuously successful result, many other people must also have been aware of the fact, and there is not a scrap of evidence to show that any one else even suspected it.

Neither Shadwell nor any one on his behalf, as Mr. Lawrence admits, ever claimed for him any share in the credit for this success; on the other hand, at a time when he and Dryden were on terms of the bitterest enmity, the latter was including *The Tempest*—then, I think it fair to say, only available in what is called the Shadwell operatic version—among “my Plays . . . in the order I wrote them,” and this, be it noted, in a public announcement, that his friends might not be imposed upon by the booksellers foisting in a supposed collection of his plays, etc., a play which was not his. That Shadwell may between the date of Davenant’s death and the issue of the 1674 4to have had a hand in *The Tempest* as it proceeded on its successful career is, I should think, quite possible: plays and operas, as is well known, did not then run for months together; their success was rather indicated by frequent revivals, and there may have been as nowadays improved versions with dresses, etc. renewed, and possibly even half a dozen “brews” of *The Tempest*. Shadwell was then a friend of Dryden and also of Reggio, the composer, and he was, which Dryden was not, a musician though only an amateur. In these circumstances I see nothing of moment in the appearance of the words of a song by him in the 1674 text, nor should I be impressed to the extent of adopting Mr. Lawrence’s view, if it could be proved to demonstration that the words of the masque were also his.

I have read again and again the Prologue and Epilogue, and have compared them with such of Shadwell’s “shambling doggerel” as was extant in 1674, but with all deference to Mr. Lawrence and also to Professor Saintsbury, if he is of the same opinion, as to which I am not quite clear, though I should be prepared to admit that he had written lines as bad, I should hesitate a very long while indeed before I ventured to pronounce them undoubtedly Shadwell’s.

In 1673 was published Ravenscroft’s *Careless Lovers*, a Lent play of that year: besides the well-known attack on Dryden in the Prologue, there are also references to him in “The Epistle to the Reader,” and though the writer may have had others, and Shadwell among them, in his mind, it is, I think, to the Laureate that this sentence mainly applies: “But if they can neither Talk, nor Write a Young *Poet* out of the Humour of Making *Plays*, they give him

o're for a peremptory Fop; and so fall to writing Sieges and Opera's——." *The Siege of Rhodes* was an old story, and Davenant had now been dead five years, but *The Conquest*, occasionally spoken of, as one could easily prove, as *The Siege, of Granada*, had been published in the previous year, and as it cannot be suggested that Dryden had at this date been concerned with any other opera, the reference, if I am right in thinking it is to him, must also be to *The Tempest*.

In *Notes and Observations on the Empress of Morocco Revised*, 1674, p. 34, Dryden is thus addressed: "Prethe dear heart set up for Operas (,) such *Knight Errantry* and *Romantick Turnes* may pass there, but Faith thy Talent of late years does not lye in *Heroicks*." This may, of course, be construed as a chaffing invitation to try an entirely new field, but I cannot help thinking it is founded on the successful issue of *The Tempest* opera venture, and that "set up" means "make this your trade."

Dryden himself describes *The State of Innocence*, on the title and in the Preface, as an *Opera*, but though he provides the words for a duet between an Angel and a woman, who is quaintly said to be "habited like Eve," he merely indicates the places for the other vocal music. If this piece had been performed, and it had appeared that at some of the prescribed points words by Shadwell had been used, it would surely be straining language to say that he had turned it into an opera. It will be noticed that on p. 1, immediately below the drop-title, there is a description of the scene, "Angels discovered above, brandishing their Swords," etc., very much in the manner of the description at the beginning of *The Tempest* of 1674.

Mr. Lawrence has quoted from the Preface before *Albion and Albanus: An Opera*, 1685, this passage: "An *Opera* is a poetical Tale or Fiction, represented by Vocal and instrumental Musick, adorned with Scenes, Machines and Dancing" (a 2).

I think it useful to add the following:—

"It (*A. & A.*) was originally intended only for a Prologue to a Play, Of the Nature of the *Tempest*; which is, a Tragedy mix'd with *Opera*; or a *Drama* Written in blank Verse, adorn'd with Scenes, Machines, Songs and Dances: So that the Fable of it is all spoken and acted by the best of the Comedians; the other part of the entertainment to be perform'd by the same singers and Dancers who are introduced in this present *Opera*" (b 2).

"The *English*, I confess, are not altogether so musical as the *French*, and yet they have been pleas'd already with the *Tempest*, and some pieccs

that follow'd, which were neither much better written, nor so well composed as this" (*b 2, verso*).

No one, I apprehend, will deny that Dryden is here speaking of *The Tempest* as an opera, but if it is thought that he is recalling the success of a piece of his own work, due to the interference of his enemy who had altered it radically, I can only say I most respectfully demur to such an opinion. *Albion and Albanus*, it will be remembered, was, owing to the political situation, a failure.

For the leading, or perhaps one ought to say the abiding, characteristics of a performance of *The Tempest* round about the time in question, I refer to *The Country Club*, 4to, 1679, p. 2.

Such noise, such stink, such smoke there was, you'd swear  
The *Tempest* surely had been acted there.  
The cries of star-board, lar-board, cheerly boys,  
Is but as demy rattles to this noise.

In *The Reasons Of Mr. Bays Changing his Religion* . . . 1688, 4to, pp. 14-15, Tom Brown puts the following into Dryden's mouth:

"Lastly, instead of sense, reason, and true passion, I introduced nothing upon the Stage but meer Show and Pageantry, Dancing, Flying, Singing, Fighting, Visions, Dreams, Exorcisms and Revelations, Charms, Witchcrafts, Fire and Gun-powder, Thunder and Lightning; till at last Spirits and Apparitions turned out the men, and poor Tragedy itself was swallowed up in an Opera."

Mr. Lawrence ascribes the idea that Dryden had written the opera, which he admits existed towards the end of the seventeenth century, to what he calls "fatuous iteration" in reproducing his original Preface, Prologue and Epilogue, and I dare say that the Man in the Street, if he thought about the matter at all, might have been thus influenced in his opinion as to the authorship, but what has to be explained is the absolute silence upon the subject of everybody but John Downes, of people connected with and interested in the contemporary theatre, and above all of people like Langbaine, only too eager to detect Dryden in appropriating another's work.

If Dryden was not concerned in perverting *The Tempest* into an opera with scenes, machines, flying spirits and fireworks, what is the opera or other work of his to which Tom Brown refers?

## THE DEVIL'S COACH-HORSES

By J. R. R. TOLKIEN.

### *Eaueres.*

"Bī hwam hit is iwrīten þus þurh þe prophete, þet ha in hare wurðinge as eaueres forroteden . . . þe ilke sari wrecches þe i þe fule wurðinge vnwedde waleweð beoð þe deofles eaueres, þet rit ham & spureð ham to don al þet he wule": *Hali Meidhad*, p. 18 (E.E.T.S., 1922). This is translated: "Of whom it is written thus by the profet (*sic*), that they in their filth rotted like boars . . . the same sorry wretches that unwedded wallow in the foul mire are the devil's boars, who rides them and spurs them to do all he will."

These two occurrences are the only evidence cited for the survival of OE. *eofo*, 'boar' in Middle English. On the strength of them the word appears in Stratmann-Bradley and in *N.E.D.* Attention, however, to the regular phonology and spelling-system of this text at once throws suspicion on the rendering 'boars.' OE. *eofo* would here certainly appear only as *eofer* or *eouer*; the MS. clearly in both cases reads *eaues*. Further, the pettifogging suspicion of the phonologist in this case receives the support of divinity: Scripture nowhere mentions boars in this libellous manner.†

It can hardly be doubted that Joel i. 17, *computruerunt iumenta in stercore suo*, is the prophet referred to. The commentary (attributed to St. Paterius) was also presumably known to the author: *jumenta quippe in stercore suo putrescere est, carnales homines in fetore luxuriæ vitam finire. Bene ergo jejunamus quando hoc mortale corpus a luxuriæ putredine per continentie condimentum custodimus—Expositio Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, in Migne, *Bibl. Patrol. Lat.*, vol. 79 (S. Gregorii v.), 1008. *Eaueres* therefore=*jumen*?, and as purely phonological considerations first suggested, *e(o)ver* 'boar'

† *Exterminavit eam aper de silva*, Ps. lxxix., appears to be the only mention of boars.

should not appear in future Middle English dictionaries, unless some further occurrences can be adduced.

The actual connections of this *eaueres*=*jumenta* compensate for this loss; we gain the earliest reference (by about two centuries) in Middle English to an interesting and important word. The curiously similar OE. *ealfara*, 'packhorse,' occurring in the *Epistola Alexandri* together with draught-oxen and camels, can be dismissed at the outset; it appears to be derived from Old French \**alferan*, *auferan*, from Spanish, from Arabic, and its resemblance in form and sense to the present word is accidental (see Napier, *Contributions to O.E. Lexicography*, Phil. Soc. Trans. 1906). Actually *eauer* is the ME. representative, phonologically exact, of OE. *eafor*. This only occurs once, and as a legal term coupled with *cumfeorm*; *cumfeorm* and *eafor* refer apparently to the obligation of his tenants to harbour the king's messengers and further them with transport facilities: see Bosworth-Toller, *Supplement*, s.vv. *aferian*, *eafor*; and Liebermann, *Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, *Wörterbuch*, *aferian* [*eafor*].†

In Old English we have, then, *eafor* (once), and derived from it *aferian*, 'perform transport service,' which is Latinised as *averiare*. This clearly points to an OE. noun †*afor*, of which *eafor* is a recognised dialectal form belonging to the West Midlands. The isolated OE. occurrence would lead one to interpret this as a noun of abstract meaning, the name of an action such as ' (horse) transport ' or ' conveyance.' Anglo-Latin, besides the above quoted *averiare*, offers nouns *averagium* (see *N.E.D.*, s.v. *Average*, sb.<sup>1</sup>), and possibly *avera*, ‡ of similar or related meaning. In Middle English, however,

† See also a long note, seen after the present note was first written, by Liebermann in *Herrigs Archiv*, 109, 75, on *aferian*, *eafor*. The present occurrence in *Hali Meïðhad* was not known to him, though its phonology clinches his proposition that ME. *aver* and its Latin and French derivatives are etymologically unconnected with *aveir* 'property.' This makes it all the more curious that connection of OE. *eafor* and *eofor* is touched upon (p. 78, note 4), and the possibility of a sense-development 'boar' to 'working horse' is glanced at. A striking but purely accidental parallel is adduced in OHG. *gāl* originally 'boar' > mod. G. Gaul 'nag.' Sufficient reason is, however, given in the present discussion for rejecting any connection between OE. *eafor* and *eofor*. All the forms in English point to a stem *af-*, *að-*, while the Germanic word for 'boar' was \**ēbur-*, without any trace of variants with a different vowel-grade nearer than Latin *aper* (whose *a* remains a difficulty for Latin philologists). OE. *eofor* is a word belonging to heroic poetry, a symbol of warlike valour, far removed from the farmyard.

‡ *Avera* seems to be a noun of action, equated with *servitium*, and implying forced labour; see *N.E.D.* s.v. *Average*<sup>1</sup>, and first quotation there from *Doomsday Book*. *Avera*, *avra* in Anglo-Latin also appears to mean 'mare,' a feminine form of ME. *aver*; see Liebermann in *Herrigs Archiv*.



there is a word *aver*, clearly related, but meaning 'draught-horse, horse used only for heavy work,' and hence later 'old horse, nag.' For this word see *N.E.D.*, s.v. *Aver*, sb. (sense 3). Evidence is there given for the existence of this word, especially in Northern and Scottish dialect, from Dunbar to Scott. A much earlier vernacular example than any there given may be added: *Sir Degrevante*,† Lincoln MS., fol. 130 (quoted in Halliwell, *Dict. of Archaic and Provincial Words*), *averes to drawe*; here the Cambridge MS. (Camden Soc., l. 149) reads *wyght horse for to drow*, providing an interesting gloss to the rarer more dialectal word—*aver*=*wyght hors*, 'strong horse.' There can be little doubt that the ME. and OE. words are related, but whether the apparent sense of OE. *eafor* or that of the ME. *aver*, 'horse,' is the more original is difficult to decide. It is not easy to see how a word meaning properly 'horse of heavy or strong build' could become, even in OE. legal language or the later Latin and French derived from it, a technical term for 'transport service'; the word *cumfeorm* with which *eafor* is coupled is a word of abstract meaning, lit. 'entertainment of strangers.' Perhaps more likely would be a development whereby a word meaning 'heavy work,' specialised in the sense of 'drawing heavy loads,' might become used of the animals employed, as if 'draught' were used as a collective term for the draught animals on an estate, and later for one of these. A somewhat similar development is probably to be assumed in the case of Latin *jumentum* itself, with specialisation of meaning from 'a yoking, yoked team' to 'one of a team of draught-animals' to 'draught-horse (not ox)'—and now in French, 'mare.'

In *N.E.D.* this *aver*, 'horse,' is assumed to be a sense-development of *aver(e)*, 'property, wealth, farm-stock, cattle,' derived from Old French *aveir*, L. *habēre*. This word (the principal ME. forms are *aver(e)*, (*h*)*avoir*, (*h*)*avour*, is abundantly evidenced. Mediæval Latin *avere*, *aver(i)um* has the same senses; such forms, and related Romance forms, are common and not confined to England. But it appears practically certain that only in England and Scotland,‡ and not on the Continent, does the sense 'beast

† *Sir Degrevante* belongs in MS. to about 1440, in composition possibly fifty years or so earlier.

‡ For this point the present note is indebted to Liebermann's article. It is there also pointed out that, whereas the *e* in *aver*-words of the 'horse' group appears to be short and often to disappear, it is originally long and accented, and never disappears, in *aver*-words of the 'property' group.

of burden, heavy draught-horse' (often contrasted with 'cattle') appear at all. In this sense 'horse' the chief forms are (i) Anglo-Latin *affrus*, rarely *aver(i)us*; (ii) Anglo-French *affre* and late (13th century) *aveir*; (iii) ME. *aver* surviving in modern times in Northern dialect as (*h*)*aver*, *afer*, *hawfer*, in Scots as *aiver*, *ayvre*.

The special sense in Anglo-Latin and Anglo-French must be due to special circumstances in England—namely, the existence here of a native word \**afor*, later *aver*, 'heavy draught,' 'heavy draught horse,' of which the Latin and French words are derivatives, though the more general mediæval *avere* of totally different origin would seem to have exerted a certain influence on their forms.

At this point the occurrence of the word in *Hali Meïðhad* is decisive, for its special form *eauer* is directly descended from the same dialect type as the isolated OE. *eafor*. This change of OE. *a* to *ea* in open syllables (*afor* > *eafor*) is a very old dialect development, and occurs only in words that were part of the natural vocabulary of English long anterior to the Norman Conquest.† In those texts in Middle English that preserve this feature—limited practically to *Hali Meïðhad*,‡ and texts more or less closely related to it in language—it never occurs in words borrowed from Old French, or even in those from Old Norse. It is a mark of native origin. Since in *Hali Meïðhad* it has been shown that *eauer* = *jumentum*, and is therefore the same word as later ME. *aver*, then ME. *aver*, 'horse,' is a native word, etymologically unconnected with *aver*, 'property.'

The ultimate connections of *aver*, 'horse,' are therefore probably to be sought in Germanic (early Germanic borrowing from Latin would also be possible). The following tentative suggestion provides a plausible theory of its relations, and perhaps may also help in elucidating the senses, and the history of the senses, of the related legal words. \**afor*, *eafor* is probably to be referred to the

† The change belongs to the prehistoric period of Old English and had ceased to be operative long before the period of French influence. But in any case it originally operated only when the vowel of the following syllable was *o*, *a*, or *u*; this condition would not have been satisfied by Latin *habere* or its Romance derivatives at any period.

‡ Here OE. *a* in open syllables (except as follows) usually appears as *ea*, *e* derived from OE. dialectal *ea*: e.g. OE. *peafian* ('peafian') > *peauien*. Before nasals invariably appears *o* from OE. dialectal *o*: e.g. OE. *wanian* ('wonian') > *wonien*. Before *c*, *g*, appears always *a* from OE. secondary *æ*, Anglian 'smoothing' of dialectal *ea*: e.g. *slacian* ('slacian'), *dragan* ('dragan') > *slakien*, *drahen*. In *Hali Meïðhad* itself Norse words of pertinent form, by chance, only occur with *a* before *k*; Old French words are rare, but cf. *sabaz*, sabbaths.

group *af-*, *að-* (gradation variant *ōð-*), whose radical sense is 'energy, vigour, labour,' and whose derivatives are numerous in Germanic languages. The following may be cited: (i) OE. *æfnan*, *efnan*, work, endure; ON. *efna*; ON. *efni*, material. (ii) OE. *afol*, strength of body; ON. *afl*; ON. *afla*, earn; OHG. *avalōn*, labour, be busy. (iii) OE. (verse) *\*afoð*, *eafoð* (exhibiting, as is usual with purely poetic words, the same dialect feature as *eafor*), strength of body. (iv) Gothic *abrs*, strong. (v) OHG. *uoba*, festival; MHG. *uop* (*uob-*), labour on land, work, practice, custom; OHG. *uoben*, MHG. and mod. G. *ueben*; OHG. *uobo*, husbandman (cf. Gothic *aba*, husband); ON. *æfr*, vehement.†

If these are the connections of *eafor*, *aver*—and they are satisfactory phonologically and semantically—the word is then connected, more distantly, with Latin *opus*; of this it might be the exact OE. cognate. This has some bearing on the etymology of *averagium*, which appears to have the sense of forced labour on the land, particularly with respect to carrying work, whether performed by beasts or men (see *N.E.D.* s.v., and Liebermann's article, p. 81). Derivation from ME. *aver*, 'horse,' has not been held satisfactory in view of the uses of *averagium*. On the other derivation from Old French *oeuvre*=Latin *opus*, even if more satisfactory in sense, is phonologically impossible. The etymology here suggested would provide a satisfactory link between all the senses. If the original sense of *\*afor*, *eafor* was 'heavy (farm) work,' it would not be difficult to understand the presence of the notion of forced labour in *averagium* and *avera*. That such a word should early be specialised in the sense of drawing heavy loads, and so introduce the notion of cart-horses, would also be easy to understand. It has been suggested above that the definite sense 'horse' is also a conceivable development from the same word. At the same time it is also possible, though purely hypothetical, that the two senses 'heavy labour' and 'strong horse,' while closely allied etymologically, really represent two different derivatives of the same stem: (i) Germanic *\*ābaz-*, the cognate of Latin *opus*; (ii) an adjective or allied noun meaning 'strong (animal),' Germanic *\*abra-z*, Gothic *abrs*, West Germanic *\*abr-*, *\*ābur*. Both these would yield in Old English *afor*, *eafor*.

† Possibly derived from Germanic is a group of Romance words for 'toil,' e.g. Fr. *ahan*, *afan*, Ital. *affanno*. Walde (*Lat. Etym. Wörterb.*, s.v. *opus*) would separate Gothic *abrs* and *aba* from the above group, not it seems for any very convincing reason.

Whatever may be the value of this theory, at least it emerges that we have in Middle English a word *aver* (West Midland *eaver*) meaning 'cart-horse' evidenced (i) soon after 1200 (*Hali Meithad*) in the West Midland form *eauer*, (ii) later, from about 1400 onwards and almost entirely in the North, in the form *aver* and its later derivatives and corruptions. Further, from its form alone this word is of native origin and must have existed in Old English in the forms *afor* and *eafor*.

The fact remains that there was something irregular in the devil's behaviour. We can abandon the picture of him riding upon rotting boars, but neither was an *aver* a beast for a gentleman to ride. In mediæval Latin, French, and English, the *aver*, though usually distinguished, expressly or by implication, from cattle, was also distinguished from horses for riding. The devil appears to have ridden his coach-horses like a postilion, but he was in worse case than Chaucer's shipman who "rood upon a rouncy as he couthe," his steeds seem indeed to have been heavy old dobbins that needed all his spurring.

This note is deeply in the debt of Mr. C. T. Onions; he examined for me the passage in MS. Bodley 34 that is in question, unearthed, when appealed to, the words of the prophet Joel and the commentary upon them, almost by return of post, and set me upon the track of the galloping cart-horses.

## NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

### THE DATE OF *SIR THOMAS MORE*

THE famous three pages in the manuscript of *The Book of Sir Thomas More* have been subjected to so many tests that it seems a little curious that the authors of *Shakespeare's Hand in Sir Thomas More* should have omitted the test of evidence of style which editors of the nineteenth century generally used to determine the approximate date of a genuine Shakespearean play. It is of course true that the statistical method is liable to abuse and that Shakespeare is, as Sir Arthur Quiller Couch has pointed out, "an artist and therefore incalculable." Nevertheless it is not unreasonable, when comparing the ideas expressed in similar passages from Shakespeare, to compare the style and rhythm as well.

It is a commonplace of criticism to note that Shakespeare in his early plays makes his sentences correspond with the lines of his verse. The lines are "end-stopped" and rhyme is quite frequent. As his style developed, metrical divisions were observed less and less until in the *Tempest* internal stops\* are so common that an end-stopped line is almost a rarity. The transition between the early and the late style is so consistent that it is not difficult to date any sustained passage of verse as "early," "middle," or "late."

Let it be assumed then, for the sake of argument, that the "three pages" are indeed Shakespeare's. Further, let all the external facts be for the moment laid aside. Where, on internal evidence alone, should the play of *Sir Thomas More* be placed in the chronological table of Shakespeare's works?

The "Shakespearean" passages in *Sir Thomas More* include a long speech made by More to a riotous mob of London citizens, in which he is given one uninterrupted passage of forty lines. It should not be difficult to compare this speech with other speeches from Shakespeare's plays which can be dated, at any rate approximately.

\* By internal stop is meant a line of verse within which a new sentence is begun.

To do this satisfactorily, it is first desirable to bring the More speech into line with the familiar text by modernising the spelling and punctuation, for, however much we may *study* the quartos or the folio, the *Globe* is likely to remain our literary text. And it is especially desirable to gain this new perspective because the author of the three pages had such rudimentary theories of spelling and punctuation.

Nay, certainly you are ;  
 For to the King God hath his office lent  
 Of dread, of justice, power and command,  
 Hath bid him rule, and willed you to obey ;  
 And, to add ampler majesty to this,  
 He hath not only lent the King his figure,  
 His throne and sword, but given him his own name,  
 Calls him a God on earth. What do you, then,  
 Rising 'gainst him that God himself installs,  
 But rise 'gainst God ? What do you to your souls  
 In doing this ? O desperate as you are,  
 Wash your foul minds with tears, and those same hands,  
 That you like rebels lift against the peace,  
 Lift up for peace, and your unreverent knees,  
 Make them your feet to kneel to be forgiven !  
 Tell me but this : what rebell captain,  
 As mutinies are incident, by his name  
 Can still the rout ? Who will obey a traitor ?  
 Or how can well that proclamation sound,  
 When there is no addition but a rebel  
 To qualify a rebel ? You'll put down strangers,  
 Kill them, cut their throats, possess their houses,  
 And lead the majesty of law in liom,  
 To slip him like a hound. Say now the king  
 (As he is clement, if the offender mourn)  
 Should so much come too short of your great trespass  
 As but to banish you, whither would you go ?  
 What country, by the nature of your error,  
 Should give you harbour ? Go you to France or Flanders,  
 To any German province, Spain or Portigal,  
 Nay, anywhere that not adheres to England,—  
 Why, you must needs be strangers ; would you be pleased  
 To find a nation of such barbarous temper,  
 That, breaking out in hideous violence,  
 Would not afford you an abode on earth,  
 Whet their detested knives against your throats,  
 Spurn you like dogs, and like as if that God  
 Owed not nor made not you, nor that the elements  
 Were not all appropriate to your comforts,  
 But chartered unto them, what would you think  
 To be thus used ? This is the strangers' case ;  
 And this your momtanish inhumanity.

The proportion of internal stops is considerable in this speech. In 41 lines there are no less than 10, that is (if we may reduce such things to figures) 1 in 4. In what play of Shakespeare do we find a long speech with the same proportion ?



In order to confine the inquiry to a small compass, it will not be unreasonable to take those plays which Dr. R. W. Chambers has mentioned as expressing the same sentiments and to compare some long passages of subjoined verse. The plays are *Richard the Second*, *Julius Caesar*, *Troilus and Cressida*, and *Coriolanus*.

In *Richard the Second* the most important parallel is Carlisle's speech in the "Deposition Scene" (iv. i. 115); it contains 35 lines with but one internal stop. *Richard the Second* is an early play usually dated about 1595.

In *Julius Caesar* the "Forum Scene" is, as has been pointed out before now, a close parallel with the More "Crowd Scene." Antony's speech is divided into sections. The first, of 35 lines, has three internal stops; the second, of 20 lines, has two; the section from l. 176 to l. 205 has four; the section from l. 216 to l. 237 has also four. The proportion for the whole speech being 13 in 105 lines, or 1 in 8. *Julius Caesar* is dated 1600-1.

*Troilus and Cressida* (c. 1602) offers an even more important parallel to the More speech in Ulysses' great speech on "Degree" (i. iii. 74) which is most closely akin both in content and rhythm. The actual proportion of internal stops is 13 in 63 lines or 1 in 4.8. But apart from mathematical evidence, which is not perhaps wholly conclusive, the best test is to read aloud the passages instanced, when it will become clear that More's speech does not belong to the period of *Richard the Second*.

It seems difficult, then, on internal evidence to place the More Speech before *Julius Caesar*; indeed, if the rhythmical tests, which are usually applied to date Shakespeare's plays, count for anything, it is later. It is still more difficult to believe that Shakespeare could have written it between 1595 and 1597.

G. B. HARRISON.

#### LYCIDAS 130, 131

But that two-handed engine at the door  
Stands ready to smite once, and smite no more.

These lines have teased editorial ingenuity into a host of interpretations. The mysterious weapon is variously construed as the sword of St. Peter, of St. Michael, of Justice, of God, the two-edged

sword of the Apocalypse, the axe of the Gospel "laid at the root of the tree," the scythe of Death, the civil power, and what not. Another guess can hardly mar their meaning.

In *Eikonoklastes* Milton is citing his opponent's complaint against tumult and sedition :

He [the opponent] goes on therefore with vehemence, to repeat the mischiefs done by these tumults. *They first petitioned, then protested; dictate next, and lastly overawe the parliament. They removed obstructions, they purged the houses, cast out rotten members.* If there were a man of iron, such as Talus, by our poet Spenser is feigned to be, the page of Justice, who with his iron flail could do all this, and expeditiously, without those deceitful forms and circumstances of law, worse than ceremonies in religion ; I say, God send it done, whether by one Talus, or by a thousand.

Again quoting he continues :

*But they subdued the men of conscience in parliament, backed and abetted all seditious and schismatical proposals against government, ecclesiastical and civil.* Now we may perceive the root of his hatred, whence it springs. It was not the king's grace, or princely goodness, but this iron flail, the people, that drove the bishops out of their baronies, out of their cathedrals, out of the lords' house, out of their copes and surplices, and all those papistical innovations, threw down the high-commission and star-chamber, gave us a triennial parliament, and what we most desired (Chap. IV., *Prose Works*, ed. St. John, i. 346 f.).

If the two-handed engine at the door is the iron flail of Talus, Milton may have recalled how that "immoveable, resistlesse" agent, "that great yron groome," battered down the castle door of Pollente and Munera, and put its corrupt inmates to flight ; or how Munera tried to divert him from his work of vengeance with showers of gold, and how he haled her out of hiding, cut off her golden hands and silver feet which "sought unrighteousness, and justice sold," cast her body into the river, and burned the "mucky pelfe. . . . The spoile of peoples evill gotten good, The which her sire had scrapt by hooke and crooke" (*F.Q.* v. ii. 27). This is to assume that the enemies of the Church are within the fold, and vengeance awaits them just outside.

But if the enemies are imagined threatening the fold from without the door, Milton may have thought of Britomart's sleepless night in Dolon's castle while Talus "watcht continually, Lying without her dore, . . . Least any should betray his lady treacherously"

(*F.Q.* v. vi.). In canto vii. Talus again "watched at the dore all night," before Britomart's pavilion, against attack from Radigund and her Amazons. The iron flail is the two-handed engine with which Talus "thresht out falshood, and did truth unfould" (v. i. 12). With it the counterfeits Braggadocchio and Trompart were "uncased, Out of the foreside of their forgerie" (v. iii. 39). He is to Artegall (Justice) "the true guide of way and vertuous government" (v. viii. 3), and almost outstrips his master in redressing ills and establishing justice in Irena's realm (v. xii. 27). Thus he wields everywhere his weapon "gainst which no flight nor rescue mote avayle," to drive out corruption, usurpation, injustice, and all other political ills with which Milton particularly charged Episcopacy.

But whatever Milton had in mind, Churton Collins is doubtless right in saying, apropos of these lines: "It is part of Milton's literary art to be at moments majestically obscure." In short, the lines in *Lycidas* are but another instance of the allusive Alexandrian splendour in which he excelled all rivals.

CHARLES G. OSGOOD.

#### ORRERY'S *BLACK PRINCE*

IN the interesting article by Mr. F. W. Payne on "The Question of Precedence between Dryden and the Earl of Orrery with regard to the English Heroic Play," the contention seems to be in favour of Orrery's *Black Prince* having been written "before the end of the year 1661," and produced in 1663; not on October 19, 1667, when Pepys described it as a "new play the first time it is acted." A few of the statements in the article are open to question, especially in regard to Orrery's movements in 1667. "A clear view of the dates" makes the reader infer that Orrery was in London "in August 1667," and then left for Charleville, Ireland, which he reached "on or about September 14," 1667. Now the fact is that Orrery was in Ireland continuously during the years 1666 and 1667. He writes from Kinsale, on July 29, August 9, and August 16, 1667, and from Charleville on September 6, 1667.

However, the present note is mainly to draw attention to a letter from Orrery, dated from Charleville, July 17, 1666, in which he

plainly states that the *Black Prince* was then (July 1666) about to be produced in London. Here is the pertinent passage from his letter to Viscount Conway and Killulta :—

17 July [1666]. Charleville : " If we meet at London, *you will see a play acted which I writ by the King's command*. I call it *Edmund the Black Prince* ; and if ever I writ anything fit for the theatre this play is it."

Thus, it would seem that the *Black Prince* had not been produced in the year 1663, but in July or August 1666. Possibly a delay may have taken place in its original production, and it is very significant that in the payment list of the Lord Chamberlain under date of October 19, 1667, the usual sum of £10 was given, a plain indication that it was not a first performance. Professor Allardyce Nicoll, in his admirable book on *Restoration Drama* (p. 96), says that Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery, was first in the field in heroic tragedy, but follows the beaten track in giving the date of production of the *Black Prince* as October 1667 instead of July 1666.

Orrery's letter, as above, will be found in the *Calendar of State Papers*, Ireland, 1666-1669, p. 158. I may add that in a previous volume, covering the years 1663-1665, Lord Orrery writes on August 25, 1664, about the production of his new play. This play is likely to have been *The General* (September 1664), as Orrery states that the players were at that date " studying it," and that he hoped to have it produced " within less than a fortnight " (*Calendar of State Papers*, 1663-1665, p. 430).

W. H. GRATTAN FLOOD.

[The above note has been submitted in proof to Mr. F. W. Payne, who writes as follows :]

(i) I am very grateful to Dr. Grattan Flood for bringing forward the letters which prove that Orrery was in Ireland when *The Black Prince* was produced in 1667. Had I known of these before I could have saved those who read my article a good deal of time, as I had to try to prove by devious methods that Morrice's Statement I., as I called it, was inaccurate, whereas these letters do it directly. As Orrery was not in England at the time of Clarendon's fall, it is impossible that he should have left soon after. Therefore Morrice's Statement I. cannot refer to 1667, which is my contention. This gives increased credibility to his second statement, that *The Black Prince* was the first play composed by Orrery.

(ii) With regard to the Lord Chamberlain's List, I should be glad if I could persuade myself that it gives any information as to the first performances, because it would tend to confirm my argument. The only

opportunity for classification that it gives is in the sums paid for the performances—£10 and £20 respectively. The only possibilities of the "£20," as far as I can see, are to indicate a new play, or a performance at Court. But if the list of plays up to the end of 1667 be examined (it is given in Professor Allardyce Nicoll's *Restoration Drama*), it will be seen that while all plays given at the Court are paid for at the rate of £20, some given at the Theatre Royal obtained £20 not being first performances, and of two certain first performances at the Theatre—April 15, 1667, and February 20, 1667-8—one was paid for with £10 and the other with £20. Therefore, all that appears from the list is that a command performance at Court meant a fee of £20, for nothing can be deduced from the fee paid for a performance at the Theatre Royal.

(iii) I cannot agree with Dr. Flood when he suggests that there was a previous production of *The Black Prince* in 1666, for the following reasons:—

- (a) The letter he quotes talks of a "play which I writ." It does not say "have just written" or even "have written." The letter conveys no impression of that sort.
- (b) Most probably, as there is no record of a 1666 performance, the production which Orrery was anticipating was delayed for a year and is the one recorded for 1667.
- (c) The statements quoted in my article constitute a body of evidence too solid to be outweighed by a letter open to the objections detailed in (a) and (b).

F. W. PAYNE.

#### THE DOUBLE GALLANT OF COLLEY CIBBER

*The Double Gallant* is what Pope would have called "a vast, vamped, future, old, revived new piece 'twixt Plautus, Fletcher, Shakespeare and Corneille." Its pedigree is indeed of quite alarming complexity. In the prologue which is printed with the first edition (1707), Cibber himself admits that "from former *Scenes* some Hints he draws," although he claims that "the Ground-Plot's wholly chang'd from what it was." In the *Apology* he describes it, more frankly, as "a Play made up of what little was tolerable in two, or three others, that had no Success, and were laid aside, as so much Poetical Lumber." A number of attempts have been made, all more or less incomplete, to identify the plays which Cibber made use of. As early as 1719 Giles Jacob had suggested (in *The Poetical Register*) Mrs. Centlivre's *Love at a Venture* as Cibber's principal source. The anonymous author of *The Laureat* (1740),

a bad-tempered pamphlet provoked by Cibber's *Apology*, was more dogmatic :

"*Æsopus* (i.e. Cibber) had a particular Knack at stealing *Scenes*. . . . There was at this Time a certain *Poetess* in *Rome*, called *Fulvia* (i.e. Mrs. Centlivre), who had sometimes succeeded in Characters of Humour on the Stage ; she offer'd a Play to the Perusal of *Æsopus* ; in this Play she had drawn the Character of a very impudent Fellow, who in the same Play acted under his own Appearance two different Persons, and persuaded his Mistress to believe him not to be himself in Opposition to her Senses ; this Character *Æsopus* scouted extremely. Why, Madam, said he, this would be putting upon the Audience indeed ; they will never bear it ; 'tis extravagant, it is outraging Nature, it is silly, and it is not ridiculous. The poor Lady was beat out of her Design ; but as our Corrector had the Play left sometime in his Hand, he culled out this very Character, mix'd it with some other Felonies of the same Nature, which he had committed, and had it acted as his own the very next Year."

Mottley, or whoever it was who was responsible for the "List of all the English Dramatic Poets" which is bound up with Whincop's *Scanderberg* (1747), also refers to this episode, but from a pro-Cibber standpoint. He says that Mrs. Centlivre submitted *Love at a Venture* at Drury Lane,

"where it was rejected ; but some Time after Mr. Cibber brought out a Play called *The Double Gallant*, or *The Sick Lady's Cure*, in which, as she used to complain, he had taken in the greatest Part of her Play. But Mr. Cibber understanding the *French* Language himself, why may we not suppose, that he translated it from the same Original, as she had done ?"

Later Mottley states definitely that *The Double Gallant* is partly derived from "a French Piece called *Le Gallant Double*, and partly from Mr. Burnaby's *Visiting Day*." The *Biographia Dramatica* of 1812 is more cautious. "Part of this play is borrowed from Mrs. Centlivre's *Love at a Venture*, or the French comedy of *Le Gallant Double*, and part from Burnaby's *Visiting Day*." More modern writers have not much to add to this. According to Genest (*English Stage*, ii. p. 389), *The Double Gallant* has been compiled from two of Burnaby's comedies—*The Ladies Visiting Day* and *The Reform'd Wife*—and from Mrs. Centlivre's *Love at a Venture*. According to the *D.N.B.* it is based upon *Love at a Venture* and *The Ladies Visiting Day*, but owes something too to Thomas Corneille's *Le Gallant Double*. Moritz Rapp (*Studien über das engl. Theater*) also adds Calderon's *Hombre pobre todo ex trazas*. More recently Professor Allardyce Nicoll has summarised Cibber's



sources as *Love at a Venture*, *The Ladies Visiting Day*, and *The Reform'd Wife*, "with title and suggestions from *Le Galant Double*" (*Eighteenth Century Drama*, p. 162).

It is remarkable that these accounts, all differing in one detail or another, are all inexact. No doubt several have been put together at second-hand. There is no evidence whatever that Cibber made use of Calderon's *Hombre pobre todo es trazas*, or of anything more than the title of the French comedy which is derived from that play, *Le Galant Double* (there is no such piece as *Le Galant Double*) of Thomas Corneille. The resemblances between Thomas Corneille and Cibber are explained by the fact that Cibber, in writing *The Double Gallant*, certainly had before him Mrs. Centlivre's *Love at a Venture*, which is taken, in some scenes quite closely, from *Le Galant Double*. It is possible, as suggested in *The Laureat*, that Cibber may have used Mrs. Centlivre's manuscript. It is, however, much more probable that he made use of the printed edition of 1706. The principal plot in *Love at a Venture*—the intrigues of Belair with Camilla and Beliza, and the devices which they necessitated for his passing himself off as two persons at once—is derived from Corneille. The underplot, which is concerned with the matrimonial relations of Sir Paul and Lady Cautious, appears to be original.\* Cibber has only borrowed from the main plot of *Love at a Venture*. He follows Mrs. Centlivre very closely, but he has been careful to give his characters new names. Thus Belair becomes Atall, Beliza becomes Clarinda, and Camilla Sylvia. The dialogue as far as possible he has rewritten completely. Cibber probably realised that *Love at a Venture* (which had been acted at Bath in 1706) would be still familiar to some of his audience in 1707. The changes which he made are not really important.

"Start no Objections, I beseech you" (says Camilla in *Love at a Venture*, Act II. Sc. i.)—"I am sure he is not married—he did not look as if he was."

"Pshah" (says Sylvia in the parallel passage in *The Double Gallant*). "Prithee don't teize me with so many ill natur'd Objections; I tell you, he is not married, I am sure he is not: for I never saw a Face look more in humour in my Life."

However, not all of Cibber's revision is as perfunctory as this. The underplot in *The Double Gallant* (the wooing of Lady Dainty,

\* Professor Nicoll has suggested Dryden's *Secret Love* as a possible source of *Love at a Venture*. I do not think this probable, though there is certainly something of Celadon in Mrs. Centlivre's Belair.

an affected but wealthy hypochondriac, by the impudent and pennyless Careless) is borrowed from *The Reform'd Wife* and *The Ladies Visiting Day*. These are two excellent "manners" comedies which are attributed to Charles Burnaby. *The Reform'd Wife* was produced and published in 1700, and *The Ladies Visiting Day* in the following year. Apparently they did not succeed on the stage. Cibber's Lady Dainty is a composite character made up out of the genteel and hypochondriac Lady Dainty of *The Reform'd Wife*, and the equally genteel Lady Lovetoy of *The Ladies Visiting Day*—Lady Lovetoy who affects the exotic and is visited at once by "a China-Woman with Cups, an India-Man with Skreens, an Armenian with Amber Necklaces, and a Bird-Man with a Monkey." The scenes in *The Double Gallant*, into which Lady Dainty enters together with the majority of those dealing with Sir Solomon Sadlife and his wife, are from Burnaby. Cibber has not even taken the trouble, except in one or two places, to rewrite the dialogue. More than a quarter of *The Double Gallant* is taken over from Burnaby's two comedies, word for word. In addition *The Reform'd Wife* seems to have suggested to Cibber the names of a number of the characters in his main plot (Cleremont, Clarinda, Sylvia).

Hazlitt, who is on the whole Cibber's most discriminating admirer, has given high praise to *The Double Gallant*. "The characters, he says, are well kept up: Atall and Lady Dainty are the two most prominent characters in this comedy, and those into which Cibber has put most of his own nature and genius. They are the essence of active impertinence and fashionable frivolity." The praise is not undeserved. But the credit for Atall and for Lady Dainty is really due, not to Cibber, but to Mrs. Centlivre and to Burnaby. Cibber was only their *impressario*.

F. W. BATESON.

#### A NOTE ON THE FIRST EDITION OF *THE PLEASURES OF IMAGINATION*

WHEN the first edition of a famous book, by an author who was *not* famous until it made him famous, is found to be common, its unity should be suspected. Reprints made within a short time, and not much (if at all) corrected, are often undifferentiated.

An example is *The Pleasures of Imagination*, published by Dodsley in quarto, 1744. Two states of this book have been distinguished by Mr. Thomas Wise (*Catalogue of the Ashley Library*, Vol. I.) and by Mr. I. A. Williams (*Seven XVIII Century Bibliographies*, pp. 88-89), according to the presence or absence of a footnote (on the word *Musical*) on the first page of the text (p. 9). Mr. Wise regards the edition without the note as the "first issue"; and as far as this point is concerned that is the natural conclusion; for (1) it is more likely that the author added such a note than that he suppressed it in the year of publication; (2) the page with the note (five lines of small type) is rather uncomfortably crowded. Mr. Williams, on the other hand, regards the edition with this note as the first issue, on the plausible ground that the note is not found in later editions of the poem, and that it is therefore natural to suppose that Akenside did suppress it.

But this difference is only one element of a more complex problem. I have before me two copies, which (following Mr. Wise provisionally) I call:

A. No footnote on page 9. Page 20 numbered 20.

B. Footnote on page 9. Page 20 numbered 22.

(Mr. Williams mentions a third variant, as A but with 22 for 20. This I have not seen.)

Comparison of the two shows at once that the title-page, the preliminary leaves, and B-N, are a different setting of type. OPQ are, I think, from the same type (though the figure 2 at the foot of O 4 *verso* is absent from A and present in B). If I am right, it is clear that a second impression was called for soon after publication, and when some of the type was still undistributed. It is noteworthy that the advertisement (Q 4) of Dodsley's *Old Plays*, which is dated January 14 and begins *The Beginning of next Month will be Publish'd*, is certainly from the same type in the two "issues."

It remains to determine the question of priority. There are several verbal differences in the part which was reset. Examples are:

Book I., l. 47:

And to the most subtile and mysterious things (A)

And to most subtile, etc. (B)

The unmetrical *the* is rather more likely to be an original misprint of A, corrected by B, than a printer's insertion in setting reprint.

## I. 573 :

O ! let the breath of thy extended praise  
 Inspire my kindling bosom to the height  
 Of this untemper'd theme (A)  
 Of this untempted theme (B)

This I think strong in favour of *A*. It does not seem likely that a printer in setting reprint substituted the meaningless *untemper'd* for the obvious *untempted*. It is more likely that *untemper'd* is an original misprint.

## II. 67 :

Now the same task (A) (unmetrical)  
 Now the same fair task (B)

This is inconclusive. *A*, if a reprint, might easily drop a word.

## II. 436 :

Cœlestial sounds (A)  
 Cœlestial rounds (B)

Here *A* is right ; but this again is inconclusive.

## III. 94 :

empty shades (A)  
 empty shapes (B)

Either might be right ; the posthumous edition of 1768 has *shades*. Either might be due to inadvertence in the compositor.

On the whole, I think the evidence favours *A* ; but it is likely enough that a less cursory comparison would find something decisive. The problem is not important ; whichever way we decide it, we have to choose between the variant readings on their merits. Still, it will have to be decided when (if ever) the time comes for an edition of Akenside. It is, moreover, an example of a trap for editors, probably more common than is suspected.

R. W. CHAPMAN.

### DRYDEN'S VISIT TO MILTON

In the first issue of *The Review of English Studies*, Mr. G. Thorn-Drury quotes an account of Dryden's visit to Milton which, he remarks, "seems to have escaped notice."

He does a service in calling attention to this passage for, though I published it in June 14, 1919, in an American weekly which was

also called *The Review*, that periodical is no longer published, and never attained a wide circulation. When Mr. Verrall spoke of Dryden's visit as "probably apocryphal" (*Lectures on Dryden*, 1914, p. 220) he must have overlooked Marvell's lines prefixed to *Paradise Lost* as well as Masson's comment on them (*Life of Milton*, vi. 716-17)—one of the many things that lie buried in Masson's great work. There can be no question as to the truth of Aubrey's account. That given in *The Monitor*, since it was written forty years after the visit took place, can hardly be trusted for details. Yet it may be right in saying that Waller accompanied Dryden. For, although Aubrey does not mention Waller, it was not necessary for him to do so, since his concern was solely with Dryden's obtaining leave to make a rimed drama of *Paradise Lost*. As Aubrey's *Lives* were not published until 1813, and as the two accounts differ in several details, there is no reason for questioning the *Monitor's* assertion that it derived the story from Dryden himself.

One thing more. Masson writes (*Life of Milton*, vi. 710), "If ever Milton laughed by himself after the departure of a visitor, it must have been on this occasion. His amusement must have lasted for some time." This picture, to me a distinctly unpleasant one, was probably suggested by the poem on *Paradise Lost* in which Marvell renewed his attack on his old enemy, Dryden. To be sure, Milton prefixed the piece to the second edition of his epic (probably because it was the best he had received), and was opposed to both rime and the Restoration stage. Yet it must be remembered that he had originally conceived his work as a play, that he received his admirer "civilly," and granted his request. Dryden's unexpected, enthusiastic praise must have sounded very pleasant to the blind poet fallen on evil days who, whatever his doubts as to the outcome, seems to have appreciated the honour that was intended. Commendation of *Paradise Lost* from one of Dryden's position and discernment was not so frequent in 1673 that Milton was likely to ridicule it.

RAYMOND D. HAVENS.

The University of Rochester,  
Rochester, New York.

## GEORGE CHAPMAN

THE following inscription, in Chapman's hand, which seems to throw some light on his early days, is taken from a copy of his *Batrachomyomachia* in the Inner Temple Library, to which it was presented by the widow of the person addressed, Anne, daughter of Sir Edward Coke. Ralph Sadler was son of Sir Thomas (d. June 5, 1606), who was son of Sir Ralph (the diplomatist, d. March 30, 1587); he married the said Anne Coke in 1601 and died February 5, 1660. Standon was Sir Ralph Sadler's residence, but he had also a manor and manor-house at Temple Dinley, in the Hundred of Hitchin.

In desire to celebrate and eternise  
 The Noble Name and House  
 where his youthe  
 was initiate  
 In the now honor'd Owner of y<sup>e</sup> virtues  
 thereof, in supplie of y<sup>e</sup> Titles;  
 The right virtuouse  
 and worthie Gent  
 Raphe Sadler  
 Esquire;  
 Geo: Chapman  
 Inscribes This Crowne and Conclusion  
 of all His Homericall Labors  
 To his Acceptors endles Memorie;  
 wishing it may renowne  
 above Title; and re-  
 maine beyond  
 Marble.

G. T.-D.

## TWO SONGS ASCRIBED TO THOMAS SHADWELL

IN the British Museum Catalogue of MSS. Additional, there is indicated a song ascribed to Thomas Shadwell (No. 19,759, f. 20 *recto*). The collection of songs, with music, in which it is to be found has the following inscription, in contemporary handwriting, on the flyleaf: "Charles Campelman his book ~/June y<sup>e</sup> 9 1681 ~/God giue him grace/1682."



Of the music to the song only the melody is given, and after the last bar appears the composer's name, "Mr Shadwell." A comparatively recent pencil note adds "(? words by)."

The following is the text of the song :—

Bright was the morning cool the Air  
 Sereen was all the Sky  
 when on the waues I left my fair  
 the Center of my Joy  
 Heaven and nature smileing wear  
 and nothing sad but I

Each rosey feild it's oder spread  
 All fragrent was the Shore  
 Each riuier God rose from his bed  
 And sight and own'd her power  
 Curling their waues they deckt their head  
 As proud of what they bore

Glide on yee watters bear these lines  
 And tell her how I am oppreat  
 Bear all my sighs yee gentle winds  
 And wafe them too her brest  
 Tell her if ere she proue unkind  
 I neuer shall haue rest

The B.M. Index of First Lines records not the above but another version of the song in MS. Addl. 30,303 (f. 5 *recto*), a collection of poems dated in the Index, c. 1650. The date however must be too early, for the collection includes pieces by Durfey and "Lord Rochester's Farewell."

Besides minor differences in spelling, the following variations may be noted: Line 1, "Clear" for "cool"; line 3, "a wave" for "the waues"; line 10, "sigh'd" for "sight"; line 11, "Curling ye waves bedeckt their head"; line 14, "how distress'd" for "how I am oppreat"; line 16, "waft" for "wafe"; line 18, "can" for "shall."

Dryden has a song, otherwise quite different, beginning "Calm was the Even, and clear was the Sky," in his *Evening's Love*, 4to., 1671; and a poem of Sedley's begins "Smooth was the water, calm the air" (quoted in A. H. Bullen's *Musa Proterva*, p. 79). Since Shadwell is known to have borrowed ideas from both of these poets, it is not unlikely that he wrote the words as well as composed the music of the song printed above.\*

\* In a somewhat similar manner Shadwell takes the hint for the song "The fringed Vallance of your eyes advance" (in his version of *Timon*, 4to., 1678, Act i.) from a line in (Shakespeare's) *The Tempest* (1. ii. 408), "The fringed Curtaines of thine eye aduance."

Another poem, not mentioned in the B.M. Catalogue, nor in the Index, is to be found in MS. Addl. 19,759, at f. 17 *verso*. As before, the music is ascribed to Mr. Shadwell, and the authorship of the words is queried. The poem reads as follows :—

Fools for themselves will Treasure prize  
Some dazling greatness blinds  
Beauty alone can charm our eyes  
and loue delight our minds  
beauty alone can charme our eyes  
and loue delight our minds

What is the use of wealth or power  
By which wee men subdue  
If not in order to gaine more  
To vanquish women too  
If not in order &c.

Beauty's the sum of all delights  
Without loue life wear vaine  
The Ambitious toyle, the valient fight  
For this for this Kings reign  
The Ambitious toyle &c.

Who er on these fix their desires  
Goe right in Naturs way  
All others are but wandering fires  
Which lead mankind astray  
All others are but &c.

No doubt the songs were intended to be sung to the accompaniment of the lute, an instrument which Shadwell claimed to have some skill in playing ; but, so far as is known, no other examples of his musical compositions are extant.

D. M. WALMSLEY.

## REVIEWS

**The Two Dated Sonnets of Shakespeare.** By J. A. FORT, formerly Second Master at Winchester College. Oxford University Press. 1924. Pp. 47. 3s. net.

**The Sonnets of Shakespeare.** Edited from the Quarto of 1609, with introduction and notes, by T. G. TUCKER, C.M.G., Litt.D., Emeritus Professor of the University of Melbourne. Cambridge University Press. 1924. Pp. lxxxviii. + 239. 17s. 6d. net.

THESE two books on the *Sonnets*, both apparently written as recreations in retirement, form a curious contrast. Mr. Fort, in a pamphlet of under fifty pages, provides plentiful entertainment, whether one agrees with him or not, and has driven home one point at least which will be used by all future investigators of the problem: he shows that sonnet 104, itself written in spring-time, fixes the date of the first meeting of the poet and his "fair friend" as April three years earlier.\* Not a large point, perhaps, but we think a certainty; and where all is in dispute every crumb of certainty is to be welcomed. We know, then, the month in which the friends met. But Mr. Fort is ready with the year also. To quote his own words:

"If these lines were addressed to some unknown person, we cannot extract anything of value from them, but if they were addressed to Southampton, we can obtain a good deal of information which will be useful in the highest degree. . . . If the poet and his patron first met in some April, we must surely place their meeting in that month on the eighteenth day of which *Venus and Adonis* was registered with the Stationers' Company, i.e. in April 1593. We cannot place their first interview in April 1594, unless we suppose that Shakespeare was introduced to his patron a whole year after the publication of *Venus and Adonis*,

\* The first sonnet, with its references to "gaudy spring," the "world's fresh ornament," "thine own bud," and the "increase" of "fairest creatures," clearly belongs to spring-time.

while, if we place it in April 1592, we must suppose that a friendship which ripened so rapidly between April 1593 and May 1594 (see the Dedications to *Venus and Adonis* and to *Lucrece*) had made no appreciable advance in the whole of the previous year. In April 1593, however, Shakespeare, as he tells us himself ("I leaue it to your Honourable suruey") in the Dedication to *Venus and Adonis*, left the MS. of the poem with the Earl for the latter's perusal; he was then presumably asking for permission to dedicate the poem to Southampton; and, since it was in an April that he first met his patron, I suggest that the day on which he took his MS. to the latter was also the day on which he was introduced to him. Eighteen days is a long enough space of time not only for that first interview, but for the reading of the MS., as well as for the return of the latter to Shakespeare's friendly publisher, Field, and also for Field's application to the Stationers' Court."

The scheme works out very prettily, and is in my judgment probably sound, more especially as, sonnet 26 being a paraphrase of the prose dedication to *Lucrece*, the first twenty-five sonnets would, according to Mr. Fort's "time-chart," belong to 1593-1594, while sonnets 27-104 would have been produced between May 1594 and April 1596. We must not, however, forget that the scheme rests on a hypothesis, the hypothesis that Southampton is the person addressed; and I think it is a pity that Mr. Fort did not ask himself whether an equally pretty scheme might not be worked out on the supposition that Pembroke and not Southampton was the patron concerned. Let us ask the question for him and see what happens.

Mr. Fort remarks that sonnet 104 reads "as though its subject had been suggested by the return of some anniversary." Yes, but what kind of anniversary? Surely a sonnet beginning

To me, fair friend, you never can be old,

is best interpreted as a birthday salutation; for myself, at any rate, I had always taken it for a birthday letter, until I read Mr. Fort. The lines—

Ah! yet doth beauty, like a dial-hand,  
Steal from his figure and no pace perceived;  
So your sweet hue, which methinks still doth stand,  
Hath motion, and mine eye may be deceived,

seem almost certainly inspired by that reminder of the inevitable passage of time which only a birthday can bring. Yet if the anniversary be a birthday, it cannot be Southampton's, which belongs to October. Pembroke, on the other hand, was born on

April 9, 1580, which falls very pat, while seeing that Shakespeare and he first met early in 1598 (as all seem agreed), the sonnet, if addressed to him, would be timed for his coming-of-age in 1601, which falls even more pat still. I do not say there is much in all this, but I cannot throw off the impression that sonnet 104 was written for some one's birthday, and therefore make the Pembrokeians a present of the 1601 suggestion.

The second of Mr. Fort's "two dated sonnets" is of course No. 107. But here, through what I can only suppose to be a fit of panic, he seems to throw away one of his trump cards. If there be any topical allusion in the *Sonnets* at all, the date 1603 is writ large all over this particular sonnet. The "mortal Moon" is patently Elizabeth; "her eclipse" means her death, as the reference to "tyrants' crests and tombs of brass" in the last line makes evident; \* the passage—

Uncertainties now crown themselves assured,  
And peace proclaims olives of endless age,

obviously point to the unexpectedly quiet accession of the peace-loving James; and in "supposed as forfeit to a confined doom" it is only natural to see a reference to the release of Southampton from the Tower. The sonnet is, in fact, one of the strongest bulwarks of the Southampton case. Mr. Fort, however, will have nothing to do with 1603; and the reason is clear—he is frightened at the yawning gap of seven years which would intervene between sonnet 104 and sonnet 107 if he accepted the traditional date for the latter. He therefore decides that the date was November, 1598, when Southampton was released from the Fleet to which he had been committed for his marriage with Elizabeth Vernon, and that the eclipse of "the mortal Moon" was nothing but the slight to the Queen which this marriage involved. Frankly we do not think any one is likely to agree with him here. Mr. Fort cannot escape his gap. On his own showing, two and a half years must have elapsed between sonnets 104 and 107; and if a cessation of correspondence (for whatever cause) lasted two and a half years, why not for seven? Moreover, once desert the date 1603 and the Southamptonite lays his flank dangerously open to the enemy. Southampton was not the only person committed to the Fleet for love—

\* I am aware that many critics do not subscribe to this interpretation, which I merely state as one that seems to me most in accordance with common sense.

affairs. We have seen that if sonnet 104 was addressed to Pembroke it must have been written in April 1601. Now, as it happens, Pembroke himself was sent to the Fleet about this time for his indiscretion with Mistress Fitton, and sonnet 107 would suit the release of Pembroke from the Fleet in 1601 quite as well as that of Southampton in 1598, much better in fact, for whereas the Southampton interpretation leaves a silence of two and a half years to be explained, the Pembroke theory would bring sonnets 104 and 107 close together, within a week or two of each other. In a word, while I am not sure that the Pembrokeians cannot make as much out of Mr. Fort's arguments (indeed, in an appendix he shows himself almost half a Pembrokeian as regards the "Dark Lady" sonnets) as the Southamptonites, I am very certain that he has written us a most stimulating and suggestive pamphlet; and I only hope he will give us more.

Professor Tucker belongs to a different order. With six times the space of Mr. Fort he has not managed to infuse the subject with a sixth of the interest. His introduction is long and tedious. It contains nothing new, and is not even abreast of recent scholarship. He affects to regard the question of the identity of the friend as of small importance; and attempts to give a judicial summing-up as between the Southampton and Pembroke theories. It is clear, however, that his sympathies are all with the latter, to the exposition of which he devotes ten to a dozen pages. Yet he never really comes to grips with Sir Sidney Lee's interpretation of "Mr. W. H.", and seems not to have heard of Colonel Ward's discovery that William Hall was married in August 1608, which satisfactorily explains that "eternitie promised by our ever-living poet" of which Thorpe speaks in his dedication. Indeed, it is very difficult to make out what authorities Professor Tucker has consulted or how he has consulted them. He refers, for example, to Wyndham's edition, somewhat disparagingly, in connection with the Platonic doctrine of "ideas"; but there is no evidence that he has studied the edition itself. Again, he quotes, without any reference, a passage from Mr. Percy Simpson about Elizabethan punctuation. After some search I discovered the passage in question in the introduction to *Shakespearian Punctuation*. But what was my surprise to find that it was taken partly from p. 8 and partly from p. 10 of this introduction, and that the paragraph which lies between the two parts and which Professor Tucker entirely suppresses, without



even a suggestion of omission, consists of a striking, and I think unanswerable, vindication of the original punctuation of the 1609 edition of the *Sonnets*, Wyndham being summoned as an independent witness in support of Mr. Simpson's argument! The following quotation from Professor Tucker himself will explain both my surprise and the apparent reason for this silent suppression: "The punctuation of Thorpe [Professor Tucker evidently imagines Thorpe to have been the printer] is so frequently absurd as to call for little consideration" (p. viii.). Again, his section on "Punctuation" opens with the words, "How little importance can be attached to that of the Quarto soon becomes evident to any reader"—a sentence which it is difficult, if not impossible, to imagine any one writing who had read Mr. Simpson's book or had studied Wyndham's edition. Is it permissible to suppose that Professor Tucker has never seen the latter, and that his attention was first called to the former by some friend just before he was going to press.

He is as contemptuous of the 1609 text in general as he is of its punctuation in particular, and the contempt in either case breeds textual licence, despite the claim in the preface that the edition is a "textually conservative" one. The punctuation is of course reformed altogether in the good old editorial fashion; the italics and capitals of the original are one and all thrown overboard; and as for verbal emendation the following specimens, mostly of Professor Tucker's own coinage, will give the reader a taste of his quality.

13. 1. *O, that you were yourself's!* [*Q. yourselfe.*] A note at the end informs us that "The loss of the old-fashioned *s* would easily occur after *f*." Which *s*, we wonder, is Professor Tucker thinking of?

23. 9. *O, let my looks* [*Q. books*] *be then the eloquence.* "Looks" was first suggested by Sewell, and is not therefore Professor Tucker's own. Nevertheless, his preference for it hardly bears out his claim to impartiality as between Pembroke and Southampton, since to the Southamptonite the *Q.* "books," occurring as it does close to sonnet 26, which is a mere paraphrase of the dedication to *Lucrece*, seems an obvious reference to that and to *Venus and Adonis*.

34. 8. *That heles* [*Q. heales*] *the wound, and cures not the disgrace.* It is possible that Shakespeare had a quibble upon "hele" (=conceal) in mind, but such a possibility surely gives no justification for textual emendation. The same criticism applies to

124. 9. *It feres not policy*, where Q. reads "feares," which seems to cause no trouble whatsoever.

113. 14. *My most true mind makes mine eye untrue*, where Q. reads "My most true minde thus maketh mine vntrue." Here Professor Tucker follows Capell; but that does not make the emendation any more credible.

124. 4. "*Weeds*" among weeds are "*flowers*" with flowers gather'd, where Q. reads "Weeds among weeds, or flowers with flowers gather'd."

153. 8. *Against strong* [Q. *strang*] *maladies a sovereign cure*, where the Q. "strang" simply preserves the Shakespearian spelling of "strange."

Here are seven serious emendations, and in every instance I think the Quarto gives the better reading. As a text, I cannot discover that this new edition of the *Sonnets* serves any useful purpose. It owes nothing to Wyndham's edition and certainly adds nothing to it. And in what different moods two editors may approach the same task is to be seen from the following passages, the first from Wyndham and the second from Professor Tucker:—

"The use of italics, capitals, and stops in the Quarto of 1609, though often obsolete, is most rarely irrational; the number of undoubted corruptions is so small as to be negligible; the weight, therefore, of the argument inclines irresistibly towards maintaining the text wherever it will yield a meaning."

"Whatever be the cause, errors are so frequent that they are apt to shake our faith in the correctness of the text in other places where it is not thus demonstrably wrong. It is here that an editor is required to proceed with great caution and frequently to act the Roman father towards his own emendations.

We are left wondering what Professor Tucker would have made of Shakespeare's *Sonnets* had he been less Roman.

But it is as a commentator rather than as an editor that Professor Tucker asks especially to be judged. His "chief endeavour" has been "to clear up as many as possible of the obscurities which commentators have left, and at the same time to correct a number of erroneous interpretations which have been more or less in vogue. If patient and repeated study can achieve any good result, it is hoped that the notes given in the following pages may not be fruitless." Of his labour and patience there

can be no question—never before have the *Sonnets* been so heavily annotated. Nor can I venture to say that the labour and patience have been everywhere fruitless, seeing that I have found it impossible to read through the 150 pages of closely printed matter which constitutes Professor Tucker's notes—the fascination of the *Sonnets* themselves kept breaking in to distract my attention from the explanations of their presenter. But I have read enough to convince myself that there is something in the composition of this particular commentator which renders him incapable of catching the spirit and mood of these extraordinary letters—flashing, light-winged, iridescent, like birds in May—from Shakespeare at his most brilliant period to his young and brilliant friend. Professor Tucker misses not merely the wood, but even the individual trees in his concentration upon the twigs.

Light seeking light doth light of light beguile;  
So ere you find where light in darkness lies,  
Your light grows dark by losing of your eyes.

Bhsy with those notes—the “obscurities” left or created by other commentators—Professor Tucker has not observed the beam in his own eye, the beam of pedantry.

J. DOVER WILSON.

**A Preface to Shakespeare.** By GEORGE H. COWLING. pp. 164.  
Methuen. 5s. net.

As Mr. Cowling remarks in his introduction, “there is no short book on Shakespeare, save perhaps the ‘Primer’ of the late Professor Dowden, which has long been out of date,” that can serve as an adequate “preface” to the study of his works; thus, this attempt to supply the want deserves serious consideration. It is on the whole well arranged, very pleasantly written, and with a high level of accuracy. Of its nine chapters the first gives in ten pages a very pretty picture of “Shakespeare’s England,” the second deals with the Elizabethan theatres, and the third with Shakespeare’s life. Then we have an admirable chapter on “the text, chronology and criticism of the plays,” followed by a short one on the poems, and two more on the plays, of which the first is concerned with “form and fable,” the second with “sources and intention.” The book ends with

a good chapter on "Shakespeare's style, language and versification," and six pages headed "the genius of Shakespeare," which read as if they originally formed part of Chapter VIII., and had been cut off and given a special title, which is too high for them. Taken as a whole, however, Mr. Cowling's "preface" is a valiant attempt to cover the ground, and likely to have a large sale. It is only when tested as a possible successor to Professor Dowden's "Primer" that doubts arise as to its adequacy. The weakest point in arrangement is the triple treatment of the plays, which is likely to confuse young students and has led Mr. Cowling into some slight discrepancies and too many "ready made" judgments. Thus, on page 36 it is suggested that it was perhaps at Montjoy's, where he went to lodge in 1598, that Shakespeare "first heard the story of Hamlet from Belleforest's *Histoires Tragiques*." As there was certainly an English play of *Hamlet* before this date, the suggestion is not happy in itself, and does not agree with the much more reasonable surmise (p. 52) that "*Hamlet* may have been on the stocks for years." On p. 110 we find the really mischievous statement: "One can only assume that periods of overwork and nervous strain brought in their train long moods of depression in which, at various times, *Hamlet*, *All's Well that Ends Well*, *Coriolanus*, *Troilus and Cressida*, and finally, *Timon of Athens* were composed." Even to seem to rank *Hamlet* with *All's Well*, *Troilus* and *Timon* is unfortunate in "a preface to Shakespeare," and when on p. 130 we find the rhetorical question, "Is there a better saga than that of Hamlet's revenge?" our heart bleeds for the examiners who will be told that Hamlet is "a fine saga written in a long mood of depression." In two other places Mr. Cowling, in the wake of greater critics, comments on the "nicety" and "indecision" which cause Hamlet "to spare his uncle at prayer." It would be interesting to hear from these commentators what they think would have happened to the play—or to Hamlet—if he had boldly and decisively stabbed Claudius in the back. It might then have occurred to them that the scene was written to exhibit not Hamlet's "nicety" or "indecision," but the morbid subtlety of his imagination. Be this as it may, it seems probable that Mr. Cowling would have given a better account of *Hamlet* if he had concentrated his remarks on it instead of scattering them in this rather careless profusion. Perhaps there was more temptation to indulge in this with *Hamlet* than with other plays, but on the other hand the writer of "a preface to Shakespeare" should be rather

especially careful as to what he says of Shakespeare's most famous play. Possibly, however, such shortcomings (a quotation from *Measure for Measure* is badly inaccurate) as we have found in Mr. Cowling's book should be welcomed. His book is really a very good book, and if it is not written with the supreme judiciality which gives a literature primer a half-century of life, it is less likely to crush the independence of its readers.

A. W. POLLARD.

**Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama.** A series of studies dealing with the authorship of sixteenth and seventeenth century plays. By H. DUGDALE SYKES. Humphrey Milford : Oxford University Press. 1924. Pp. viii. + 231. 12s. 6d. net.

THE ten papers printed in this volume have, with one exception, already appeared elsewhere and most of them are already known to students of their subject. They are all attempts to ascertain the authorship of anonymous, composite, or supposed wrongly attributed plays by the method which may most conveniently, if not quite fairly, be described as that of parallel passages. The following are the principal conclusions which Mr. Sykes puts forward in this volume : that *Timon* was written originally by Day and Middleton and worked over by Shakespeare ; that the *Famous Victories of Henry V.*, the prose alterations to *Dr. Faustus*, and the prose of *A Shrew* and *Wily Beguiled* were the work of Samuel Rowley ; that *Alphonsus Emperor of Germany* is by Peele, with the assistance of some one familiar with German and Germany ; that *Lust's Dominion* is identical with the *Spanish Moor's Tragedy* mentioned in Henslowe's *Diary*, and is by Dekker ; that *Appius and Virginia*, in spite of Rupert Brooke's argument to the contrary, is the work of John Webster, who also wrote, with Massinger, the *Fair Maid of the Inn*, and, with Middleton, *Anything for a Quiet Life* ; that *The Queen or the Excellency of her Sex* is, as was maintained by Bang, the work of John Ford, and that Ford wrote also *The Spanish Gipsy* ; and lastly that Nathaniel Field collaborated in the " Beaumont and Fletcher " plays *Four Plays in One*, *The Queen of Corinth*, and *The Knight of Malta*. In an Appendix Mr. Sykes states, without

argument, his views regarding the authorship of thirty-six other plays of the period.

There has been, I think, for some years past among English scholars a growing scepticism as to the value of parallel passages for the proof of authorship, and certainly such scepticism is justified in the case of some of the work done on these lines by young students who have been unable to distinguish between real "parallels" and commonplace phrases which may be found in almost any writer of their period. The successful use of the method demands not only a keen sense of literary style combined with a logical mind and common sense, but also a very wide reading in literature of the time and a retentive memory, and this combination of qualities and experience is far from common.

At the same time, however, it would be foolish to deny that both style and what, for brevity, we may call mental attitude are real and comparatively permanent attributes of a writer and that, investigated with due care and skill, they can afford at least as good evidence of authorship as the casual statements of contemporaries of whose opportunities of knowledge and care for accuracy we are ignorant. We must, however, remember that the value of "parallels" varies almost exactly in proportion to the difficulty of detecting them. The least valuable are those striking phrases which any reader of a poem or hearer of a play would be likely to remember and which might even in some cases become proverbial. The occurrence of these in two works, as of evident imitations or parodies\* of one work in another, is surely stronger evidence of different authorship than of the same. Of little more use are those similarities in treatment of a situation or in political or other sentiments which may equally well imply common authorship or imitation whether conscious or unconscious. When, however, in two works we meet with the same minor and doubtless unconscious tricks of speech, as, for example, the reiteration of "I warrant," or "I, poor I," or "I mean" (introducing an explanation or synonym), provided, of course, that such reiteration is not confined to a particular character and intended as a mark of his speech; or when we find a frequent use of certain rare words or words in unusual senses; the probability of common authorship becomes much

\* Few writers, save Swinburne, seem to have parodied themselves, at least in print, and even in the *Heptalogia* there are six parodies of others against one of the author himself!



greater, though when dealing with vocabulary constant watchfulness is necessary lest we confuse a choice of words following naturally from the circumstances of the case with one peculiar to an author. The strongest argument for identity is, however, undoubtedly the discovery of the same kind of indebtedness to the same other writers, whether by borrowing or by imitation. When in two works we find passages evidently based on the same two or more other plays or books, especially if we can find no borrowing from elsewhere, it is difficult to resist the conviction that the two works have a common author. The known habits of the Elizabethans as regards the keeping of commonplace books render such use of quotations from the same sources in an author's works, especially those of the same period, a very usual occurrence; whereas that two different authors should chance to have in their notebooks extracts from the same works and from no others is in the highest degree unlikely.

Mr. Dugdale Sykes differs from many "parallel hunters" in laying by far the greatest stress on parallels of these two last kinds, and for this reason his results are of far more than usual weight. Thus, to take a single instance, Webster is known to have borrowed in plays certainly his from Florio's *Montaigne* and the *Arcadia*. Mr. Sykes finds borrowings from both these works in *Appius and Virginia*, whereas he finds no such borrowings in Heywood, to whom this play has been attributed. This, apart from other arguments which Mr. Sykes adduces, tells strongly in favour of Webster's authorship.

It is quite impossible in the course of a review to discuss the validity of Mr. Sykes's reasonings in particular cases, for it is of the essence of proof by this method of parallels that it can only be refuted by equally numerous parallels which point in another direction. It may, however, be said that he seems everywhere to handle his evidence with the most scrupulous fairness, and though perhaps in one or two cases his readers may feel a little less positive than he does that his evidence amounts to actual proof, the conclusions to which he has come must undoubtedly in any future discussion of the Elizabethan drama receive the most careful consideration.

R. B. MCKERROW.

**A History of Early Eighteenth-Century Drama, 1700 to 1750.** By ALLARDYCE NICOLL. Cambridge University Press. 1925. Pp. xii. + 431. 18s. net.

PROFESSOR NICOLL's latest instalment of the history of English drama since the Restoration brings the story down to 1750, and the reader's first feeling is one of amazement and of gratitude that he has accomplished so much in the short time that has elapsed since the publication of his *Restoration Drama* less than two years ago. As one studies the new volume, one's admiration grows for the industry and enthusiasm which have enabled him to read so many plays, almost all of which are at best of quite secondary value except from the historical standpoint. He has waded through tragedies, comedies, and miscellaneous forms of dramatic production, to read which must have required much pertinacity; as a result, his knowledge of the theatre of the period is extensive and detailed. The appendices alone suffice to prove this, and all future workers in this field will be deeply indebted to him for his *Hand-List of Plays* with its record of individual performances, and for the repertoires of French and Italian comedians. These, the index of dramatic works and authors, and the documents relating to the stage are invaluable. No one has before attempted such a survey of the period, possibly because hitherto no one has made himself equally master of the subject.

For this there are other reasons than mere disinclination to devote so much labour to a comparatively barren field. Mr. Nicoll gives us the clue when he calls the period one of decay and disintegration. It experiments in many directions, it lays down rules, it enunciates theories. But with all the critical pedantry, there is no clear conception of what is desirable or attainable. The audiences reject what the critics demand; the critics denounce what, in practice, is acceptable to the managers and their patrons. Thus we are told "the 'rules' were everywhere worshipped in theory; in practice a very considerable amount of latitude was permitted" (p. 52), and, a few pages later, "Pseudo-classical plays were extolled by the critics; . . . yet on the whole pseudo-classicism was not deeply welcomed by the audiences of the age." "Sentimentalism," we learn on p. 127, "holds in relation to comedy much the same position that classicism does to tragedy. . . . Almost every writer

was infected more or less by its spirit, yet pure sentimentalism was not popular, and the number of perfectly unadulterated sentimental comedies hardly exceeds half a score." And, as a last quotation bearing on this point: "Pantomime, Italian opera and ballad-opera must all be taken as displaying in marked form the disintegrating elements in the eighteenth-century theatre. . . . The old had been killed, and the new was but barely born. Everything conspired towards a weakening of the drama. Sentimentalism had worn out comedy; the elements making for true tragic productivity were absent; song had come from Italy and dancing from France; the spectators were artificial and affected, seeking always after novelty. Pantomime, ballad-operas, 'Hurllothumbos' exactly suited their tastes" (p. 258).

A great dramatist might conceivably have guided his spectators among this welter of ideas and have found the mean between theory and practice: in the first half of the eighteenth-century no such genius arose, and the audiences dictated while the playwrights followed. Not the least noticeable of Mr. Nicoll's points, is the gradual rise to importance of the middle classes in the theatrical as in the political world. All that he says of *The Audience* and *The Theatre* is profoundly interesting, for he is certainly right in supposing that the drama is "more fully explained by a reference to the audience than by a reference to any other thing." Public taste, more than any other factor, led to the decay of classic tragedy and of the comedy of manners. Conversely, the theatre "is always a sure index of public taste and of almost intangible literary and intellectual movements," and, so he believes, "only through a study of the stage of these years can we gain a true impression of the literary developments and ideals of the early eighteenth century."

These, as far as we can discover, appear to be Mr. Nicoll's main conclusions, and he enforces them, with the necessary variations, in his several chapters on *Tragedy*, *Comedy* and *Miscellaneous Forms of Drama*, supporting always his arguments by detailed references to his authorities. Whenever the opportunity offers, he shows reason for his belief in the continuity of English dramatic history, and there are also statements, which it would be less easy to substantiate, about the descent of Ibsen and Björnson from "George Lillo, the forgotten playwright of 1730," who, in his own attempts and those of his imitators, the bourgeois dramatists, "anticipates the problem play of later years."

The thread of Professor Nicoll's argument would be easier to unravel, were the bulk of his references relegated to appendices and the historical, literary and critical theories and conclusions presented in a more attractive and less inchoate form. It is essential to have properly documented evidence which each student may, if he so desire, verify in detail for himself. We have already paid grateful tribute to Mr. Nicoll's industry and care in the provision of this material. But his work is not, nor is it intended to be merely a source-book. Yet page after page of the text is filled by titles, which, so presented, are simply a hindrance to the reader who wishes to peruse it consecutively; while many other pages contain the briefest analyses—doubtless all they deserve, but in this summary form quite insufficient to leave any distinct impression on the memory—of plays which have sunk into merited obscurity. As a consequence, to quote the author's words in a different context, "a frigid chill enwraps the whole work." The humanities are ill-served when a scholar allows himself to be well-nigh swamped by his accumulation of facts and the weight of his learning. Literary history, of all things, demands adequate literary treatment, and in this, with all its merits, Professor Nicoll's volume fails.

His trick of inversion (*e.g.* "Again and again went the dramatists to Molière," p. 143), frequent grammatical slips (*e.g.* "none *were*"; "to whom *has* been attributed four plays"; "it never *sunk*"), and errors in construction (*e.g.* "double *than*"; "centering *around*"; "proclaim *on* the happiness"; "quite uncertain *as to* whether"), are minor, but very real, blots on his scholarship. It is more serious that so learned a work, while it will certainly serve as raw material for any future historian of the drama, cannot, great as is, in some respects, Mr. Nicoll's achievement, be regarded as a literary presentation of the subject.

EDITH J. MORLEY.

**The Fable of the Bees: or, Private Vices, Publick Benefits.**

By BERNARD MANDEVILLE. With a Commentary Critical, Historical, and Explanatory by F. B. KAYE. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1924. 2 vols. £2 2s. net.

DEFENDING luxury, as usual, Johnson argued that you cannot spend money extravagantly without doing good to the poor. To give in

charity may be more virtuous, but it keeps the poor idle, and it may be done out of mere pride. Miss Seward asked whether this was not Mandeville's doctrine of "private vices, public benefits." Johnson criticised *The Fable*, and added, "I read Mandeville forty or fifty years ago. He did not puzzle me; he opened my eyes into real life very much." This passage from Boswell has troubled some who know Mandeville only by repute as the writer of a book said to be diabolically clever, which was publicly condemned, and which attacked "the enthusiastic passion for Charity Schools" on the one hand, and, on the other, the munificent bequests to the University of Oxford of Dr. John Radcliffe.

Mandeville was a Dutchman, born in Rotterdam, and there educated in the Erasmian School. He had a sound training in philosophy and medicine at Leyden, travelled, came to England early in the reign of the Dutch William III., "found the country and the manners agreeable to his humour," and remained. He married an English wife in 1699, and by publishing, in 1703, *Some Fables after the Easie and Familiar Method of Monsieur de la Fontaine*, showed that he had then mastered the language. We know surprisingly little of his life in London. He was on terms of intimacy with Lord Macclesfield, the Lord Chancellor, and, professionally at least, with Sir Hans Sloane. He had the reputation of enjoying the coarser pleasures of life; but as he lost no opportunity of vexing his critics, especially his clerical critics, his reputation may be something of their making. He left his daughter a hundred a year, and an income of five hundred to his son. We know, in fact, very little of the man who opened Johnson's views into real life. Perhaps we may learn more if the commonplace books of Lord Macclesfield, which are said to exist, are ever published.

*The Fable of the Bees* was some twenty years in the making. It began its life in 1705, an anonymous sixpenny quarto of verses, bearing the title *The Grumbling Hive: or Knaves Turn'd Honest*. Nine years later the verses reappeared along with the first edition of *The Fable of the Bees*, which, besides an elaborate commentary on the original poem in the form of twenty *Remarks*, consisted of an essay entitled *An Enquiry into the Origin of Moral Virtue*. Another interval of nine years followed: then, in 1723, a five-shilling edition appeared with two additional essays—*On Charity and Charity Schools* and *A Search into the Nature of Society*. Here

Mandeville was inviting attack, and the attack came, as was natural, from the friends of the Charity Schools. The Grand Jury of Middlesex presented the book as a public nuisance. This led to a third edition, in 1724, containing a defence; and four more editions had appeared by 1732. Meanwhile Mandeville had been busy on the Preface and six dialogues which, amplifying and defending his doctrines, appeared in 1728 as Part II., an independent publication "by the author of the First Part." Of this second part two more editions appeared before the two parts were published together as one work, in two volumes, in 1733, soon after the author's death. Edinburgh publishers took the book up in 1755, and translations appeared in France and Germany. The second Edinburgh issue of 1755 bore a false title-page ascribed to Jacob Tonson, 1734, and naming Mandeville. All earlier editions are anonymous.

On any showing, this is a complex bibliographical story, and an edition of *The Fable* which offers a critical text is a service to scholarship. This and much more Mr. F. B. Kaye has given us in the two handsome volumes published by the Clarendon Press. Students of philosophy and ethics, literature and economics, all have their account with Mandeville, and they will find in Mr. Kaye's scholarly introductory essays and exhaustive commentary very agreeable evidence of the pains and research that have gone to the making of an admirable edition of a very refreshing work.

Mandeville is a most entertaining sceptic. Whatever meaning we care to give to the term "Platonism" we are likely to find its antithesis in him. He is scornful of Utopian thought. Speaking with the unemotional detachment of an anatomist, he says, "Writers are always teaching men what they should be and hardly ever trouble their heads with telling them what they really are. As for my part, I believe man (besides skin, flesh, bones, etc., that are obvious to the eye) to be a compound of various passions, that all of them as they are provoked and come uppermost, govern him by turn whether he will or no." To appreciate his terms vice and virtue, we must understand that all natural impulses are vicious, and only unselfishness is virtuous. Further, we must recognise that the welfare of the hive is not an absolute welfare but the prosperity it seeks. Trades, arts, crafts, and the manifold activities of a community are all set in operation and maintained by individual selfishnesses, and thus "Private Vices are Publick Benefits." Such selfishness is useful vice. Harmful vice is to be discouraged; but



honesty demands that we should not be hypocrites in our explanation of the prosperity of the hive. It is politic to encourage moral virtues. They have their origin in pride and shame, the counterpart of pride. The moral virtues, according to Mandeville, are "the political offspring which flattery begot upon pride." There is, of course, altruism in the world, but men deceive themselves if they do not see that it, too, has its roots in selfishness. The most amiable of the vices he found to be pity. Yet people give alms to a beggar, not from unselfishness but from the same motive as they pay their corn-cutter, to walk easy. In a century that saw the foundation of the Foundling Hospital and many other benevolent institutions, as well as the amazing growth of the Charity Schools, this was an irritating doctrine. One can see how Johnson's eyes were opened to a new view of real life. There is a great deal of hard and dirty labour to be done if the hive is to be thriving, and this demands a class of poor workers, whose poverty is their only incentive to work. National wealth consists in a "multitude of laborious poor." To educate this class will induce in them a desire to avoid hard labour. Moreover, the efforts to follow up such education by placing the pupils in jobs will interfere with the natural adjustment of employment, for "proportion in numbers in every trade is never better kept than when nobody meddles with it." Mandeville's irony is at its best in his essay on Charity Schools. His apparent brutality lies in the candour of his analysis of a movement in which sentiment played an easy part.

Equally bold is his attack on Shaftesbury. He pictures him educated under John Locke, a mild and able tutor, growing into the belief that he is virtuous because his passions lie dormant: he forms fine notions in his closet and talks eloquently of them in company. He is an inactive spirit. His boasted middle way in the calm virtues might qualify a man for the stupid enjoyments of a monastic life, but never stir him up to perilous undertakings. To such a one, man may well be made for society, but in truth he is naturally the least sociable of animals.

Mandeville's influence has been remarkable. He was attacked in his own day by William Law and John Dennis, both of whom served his ends by losing their patience. Other critics, like Hume and Adam Smith, accepted his analyses, but refused his definition of vice. "If it be vice which produces all the good in the world," said Hume, "there is something the matter with our terminology."

So, in a way, he became the parent of a utilitarian scheme of ethics, and in the solving of his paradox, we find ourselves in the atmosphere of the present day. Bentham and Godwin praised him, and James Mill defended him. He drove his critics towards utilitarianism by making a rigorous ethical position intolerable. In economic theory he influenced Adam Smith by his brilliant statements of the implications of division of labour. The problem of the value of luxury, admirably treated in the fable, influenced Voltaire and eighteenth-century French thought. Explicit in *The Fable* is what we now call the *laissez faire* doctrine, and the fact that Mandeville maintains it explicitly constitutes perhaps the most important aspect of his influence on economic thought. Mr. Kaye is justified in concluding his introduction with the question whether a dozen English works can be found in the eighteenth century of such historical importance as *The Fable of the Bees*; but if on this point there were any doubt, he sets it at rest in an admirable body of appendices, where he gathers the criticisms of William Law, John Dennis, Bishop Berkeley, Adam Smith, and others, and summarises them. Further, he has gathered and arranged chronologically over three hundred references of an appreciative or critical character bearing on Mandeville's work, many of them of considerable importance, and all significant. Amongst these will be found Mr. Shaw's remark on the "purblindly courageous moralists like Mandeville and La Rochefoucauld who merely state unpleasant facts without denying the validity of current ideals, and who indeed depend on those ideals to make their statements piquant." Mr. Shaw himself, we know, frequently denies the validity of current ideals, but he depends on them to make his statements piquant quite in the manner of Mandeville.

A. W. REED.

**Eighteenth-Century English Romantic Poetry (up till the publication of the "Lyrical Ballads," 1798).** By ERIC PARTRIDGE, M.A., B.Litt.(Oxon.). Paris: Edouard Champion. 1924. Pp. x. + 260. 25 fr. (B. H. Blackwell, Ltd., Oxford.)

IN an Oxford lecture on *Romantic Fallacies*, subsequently published in *The Art of Poetry*, the late W. P. Ker told his audience that it was time that certain technical misuses of the name "romantic" should

be discouraged. The Romantic Revival and the Romantic Age of poetry, he suggested, had been overworked by critics and historians. To Mr. Arthur Symonds' statement that "what is really meant by the name romantic movement is simply the reawakening of the imagination, a reawakening to a sense of beauty and strangeness in natural things and in all the impulses of the mind and the senses," he replied, "As historians or critics what are we to do when we come to inquire about things or poems that are indeed romantic? Ought we not to make a stand, and say that romance has meanings of its own, that 'romantic' is too narrow a term for . . . a sense of beauty and strangeness in natural things and in all the impulses of the mind and the senses?"

There was a romantic movement in the eighteenth century and earlier that Dryden called "the fairy way of writing," and Hurd, "a world of fine fabling." This romantic movement W. P. Ker traced in his lecture, giving to the word "romantic" the meaning it must have "for the sake of the language and the dictionary." Our quarrel with Mr. Partridge is that he encourages the heresy that "one has come to recognise a certain wide interpretation of the term 'romantic.'" If, however, we allow him this vague and wide interpretation we shall find that he has spared himself no pains in gathering material to illustrate his thesis. Here, as a hunting-ground for the student, his book will not fail of its purpose, despite its pedestrian arrangement chronologically under such heads as *Lyrical Writers*, *Scottish Poets*, *The Mournful Group*, *The Moral Describers of Nature*, *The Mediævalists*. He makes admirable use of the best comments of some of the earlier critics in the field he has explored, but is not afraid of expressing his own views. His sincerity, in fact, is both engaging and disarming. He has certainly collected and made accessible a notable miscellany of illustrative material and fact that it will be convenient to have at hand. One cannot read his book, however, without feeling the very obvious justice of W. P. Ker's complaint of this unhappy misuse of the good word "romantic."

A. W. REED.

Mrs. Piozzi's "Anecdotes of the Late Samuel Johnson, LL.D." Edited by S. C. ROBERTS. Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d. net.

PUBLISHED in March 1786, sold out on the day of publication, and reprinted three times in the same year, Mrs. Piozzi's *Anecdotes* enjoyed a success which did not last. The world deserted to the standard of Boswell; and it was not until more than thirty years later that the book began to be again reprinted, either separately or as a part of the aggregate called *Johnsoniana* which was appended to editions of Boswell. So Mrs. Piozzi took her place as one of a crowd of satellites, accompanying the planet Boswell in his stately revolution about a solar Johnson. This nebular collection solidified in time into the compact mass known as Birkbeck Hill's *Johnsonian Miscellanies*.

Mr. Roberts and the Cambridge Press have done well to revive Mrs. Piozzi as a separate luminary. Birkbeck Hill is, indeed, sufficient unto salvation; but his is not a bedside volume, and the *Anecdotes* are eminently suited to desultory reading. We could not wish for a handier or a prettier edition.

Whatever view may be taken of the Johnson-Thrale controversy, it will hardly be questioned that Mrs. Piozzi was a bad historian. She was wiggle-waggle. Prejudice, bias, inaccuracy, and vanity are either patent, or may be suspected to be latent, in every story she tells. She even obtrudes her own incorrigible style into the quoted dicta of the Sage. We cannot wonder at Boswell's impatience. Boswell had his own inconsequences, but he was a scholar and an artist, and he must have been irritated by the clumsiness of his rival's portrait; not merely by the blunders of detail, but even more, perhaps, by the unequal tones, the ugly clash of light and shade. But if the faults of the book were an offence, its merits may have been equally vexing. Mrs. Thrale had incomparable advantages; and Mrs. Piozzi used them, not indeed with skill or tact, but with energy and vivacity. The author of the *Anecdotes* was the same woman who danced on her eightieth birthday 'and proved to the company that the season of infirmity was yet far distant.'

The particular anecdotes are like the story as a whole. When we can check them, we have generally reason to suspect them of

inexactitude. When we cannot check them, we must make allowances. But her statements and her quotations—accurate or inaccurate, right or wrong—cannot be neglected. They are a very important part of the body of evidence ; and every man who wishes to know Johnson must arrange and estimate the evidence for himself.

Mr. Roberts has not taken his duties lightly. He has given us a full and judicious introduction, and he has taken trouble with the text. He prints the fourth edition, as Birkbeck Hill did ; but he has collated it with the first, and recorded the variants. The text is not quite as perfect, or the critical notes as complete, as another edition will no doubt make them. On page 102 *We must fix them* is in the first edition, and doubtless in all editions, but it does not seem to be sense. Read then ? On p. 113 *an enemy* is nonsense ; read with the first edition, *no enemy*. On p. 48, *perpetui præmia lactis* should be *perpetua* as in Boswell. The meaning is not that Sir Joseph Banks's goat was inexhaustible, but that she earned (in the words of a contemporary translator) "ease and perpetual pasture" when her voyaging came to an end. On p. 30, Birkbeck Hill plausibly conjectured that in the imaginary reply to Burke, *see their vile agents in the house of parliament* was a misreading for *fee* ; and on the next page, in the famous account of Boswell's note-taking, he proposed *stealthily* for *steadily*. These conjectures should surely have been mentioned ; unless, indeed, they can be refuted from the manuscript, which is preserved in the Pierpont Morgan Library.

The value of the edition would be greatly enhanced by a few notes on obscure places. A page or two would do—there is no occasion to enter into competition with Hill. But the book contains a good many anonymous allusions, which must beat the novice. A word would tell us that the well-known author who published his poems in 1777 was Tom Warton, that the man who would talk about Catiline's conspiracy was Charles James Fox, that the eminent writer whom Johnson parodied was Gray, that the young gentleman whom he considered as unlikely to propagate understanding was Sir John Lade. Mr. Roberts has not indexed these nameless victims ; so that even if we guess, we cannot verify our guesses. If he will rectify these omissions when he prints a second impression, his work will be wholly delightful.

R. W. CHAPMAN.

**A History of the American Drama from the Beginning to the Civil War.** By ARTHUR HOBSON QUINN, Professor of English, University of Pennsylvania. Harper & Brothers, New York and London. Pp. xv.+486. \$4.

PROFESSOR QUINN has done a good work in attempting to trace in comparative fulness the fortunes of the American drama from its beginnings in the eighteenth century to 1860. While his survey is not so detailed as, for example, is that of Seilhamer, he has succeeded in tracing more clearly the broader lines of development and in estimating more surely the intrinsic value of the work produced. His careful scrutiny, too, of early manuscript material has enabled him to correct many previous errors, and his List of American Plays given in the Appendix should prove of immense value for reference.

In general, Professor Quinn has adopted a calm and dispassionate attitude towards the material with which he deals, and he is not afraid to confess to the poverty visible in the dramatic output of many periods treated in his history—a poverty the less to be ashamed of in view of the condition of contemporary English drama and the more intensified by the sterling excellence of such a playwright as Bird, whom the author has every justification in praising. It is rather in his *obiter dicta* concerning English drama that one might be tempted to differ from Professor Quinn. Surely it is hardly fair to say that "*The Beaux Stratagem, The Recruiting Officer, The Suspicious Husband, and The Careless Husband . . .* fail by sheer lack of sincerity" (p. 11)? The implied condemnation of Burgoyne, Mrs. Inchbald, Holcroft, Colman, Tobin and Morton (p. 109) is scarcely just; and it is strange to read *à propos* of *The Colleen Bawn* that "Boucicault was able to translate" the contrasts in the Celtic nature "into terms of real life, as far from the burlesque of his predecessors as it is from the sugary sentimentality of his successors in the romantic Irish play or of the grotesque satire of *The Playboy of the Western World*" (p. 379). We may admire Boucicault, but no amount of admiration for *The Colleen Bawn* can erase the memories of that delightful realistic fantasy conjured up by Synge. These *obiter dicta* clash markedly with the restrained judgments expressed elsewhere in the book. Sometimes, too, the author seems to neglect what may be called English sources of information on his subject. He says nothing, for example, of Chetwood's interesting story of the itinerant actors who visited Jamaica in 1733



and who were cast away on their journey thence to Carolina, where they intended "to join another company at *Charlestown*," nor does he use several of the later theatrical biographies and memoirs which contain matter appertaining to the American theatre. In spite of such lacunæ, however, Professor Quinn's work will obviously take rank as a standard account of its subject.

For the most part American drama, thus seen in relief, pursued a path parallel with the drama in London. There is the same influence of Kotzebue, the same passion for the romantic French *mélodrame*, the same struggle between playwright and actor, or between stock company performer and star. Only in one thing did the American drama provide something new. As during the Commonwealth period in England, many unacted plays of a political tendency were penned during the time of war with England, and those plays seem to have given inspiration to others written for the stages set up when peace had come. The dramatisation of recent political events has always been *taboo* in this country mainly owing to the rigours of a censorship which decorously forbids the introduction of party controversy and of living personalities on the stage. The history of American drama as told by Professor Quinn is thus an interesting parallel and complement to the history of the English stage. All those who know of the more recent developments of theatrical art in New York will look forward with keen anticipation to the second volume of his study, which promises to carry the survey onwards to the present day.

ALLARDYCE NICOLL.

**Four Birds of Noahs Arke.** By THOMAS DEKKER. Edited by F. P. WILSON. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1924. Pp. xvi. + 286. 7s. 6d. net.

THANKS to the initiative of Mr. F. P. Wilson and the liberality of Mr. S. R. Christie-Miller in permitting the use of his copy of the *Four Birds*, it is now for the first time possible for students to read this book in its complete form. Even as printed by Grosart from a copy lacking nearly a quarter, in odd leaves scattered throughout the book, it was hailed as one of the best collections of private devotions in the language, and not only for this reason but as showing a new side of Dekker's character and talent it must be regarded as

of especial interest. The book has been very pleasantly produced at the Shakespeare Head Press in line for line reprint of the original and in similar size and general style. Mr. Wilson contributes a brief but sufficient introduction and a Bibliographical Note describing in detail the three known copies of the book. One would guess that the "Short and pithie Sentences" with which the work closes were not the product of Dekker's own reading in the Church Fathers, and the editor has traced them to one of the numerous collections of apophthegmata beloved as source-books by writers of the period.

R. B. McK.

**The Bodley Head Quartos.** Edited by G. B. HARRISON.

XI. Thomas Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse, his Supplication to the Divell* (1592); XII. Anthony Munday, *The English Romayne Lyfe* (1582). Pp. xiv. + 138 and xxii. + 106. Cloth 3s. net each; paper 2s. 6d. net.

These two volumes complete the first dozen of this useful series. It is satisfactory to note that its success has been sufficient to warrant its further continuance, and that other volumes are already announced. The two volumes now to hand will be welcomed equally by students, though of slightly different kinds. *Pierce Penilesse* has long been a notorious book, one that is generally discussed at some length in histories of Elizabethan literature, but it has not been easy to obtain in separate form. This reprint will be useful to all literary students as an example of the great group of early prose pamphlets which are so important and still so difficult to study on account of their inaccessibility. *The English Romayne Lyfe* will appeal rather to those interested in the byways of history than to the student of literature pure and simple, but those who read it will find that it throws an interesting, if lurid, light on certain aspects of the period, and incidentally on the author himself. Though well known by name, the book has, I believe, hitherto only been reprinted in the *Harleian Miscellany*. The volumes contain short, but sufficient, introductions by the editor, facsimiles of the original title-pages and, in the case of Munday's book, of a two-page illustration of the martyrdom of Richard Atkins.

R. B. McK.

## SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

BY EDITH C. BATHO

ANGLIA, Vol. LXIX. (new series Vol. XXXVII.), January 1925—

Das Sonett in der englischen Literatur (Walter F. Schirmer), pp. 1-31.

Charles Kingsley als sozialreformatrischer Schriftsteller (Ella Juhnke), pp. 32-79.

The Indebtedness of Ford's *Perkin Warbeck* to Gainsford (Mildred C. Struble), pp. 80-91.

BODLEIAN QUARTERLY RECORD, Vol. IV., January 1925—

The Whole Duty of Man: Richard and James Allestree (F.M.), pp. 175-76.

Corroborative evidence of authorship.

CORNHILL MAGAZINE, March 1925—

Fragments of Autobiography, I. (Thomas Hughes: edited by Henry C. Shelley), pp. 280-9.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Vol. LIX., February 1925—

*The Chance of the Dice* (Eleanor Prescott Hammond), pp. 1-16.

MS. Bodl. Fairfax 16 foll. 148 ff., edited in full for first time.

Der Einfluss Goethes auf George Meredith (Maria Krusemeyer), pp. 17-61.

Neue englische Dramen (Karl Arns), pp. 62-77.

Special study of W. Archer, *The Green Goddess*; H. Granville-Barker, *The Secret Life*; C. K. Munro, *The Rumour*; Allan Monkhouse, *The Conquering Hero*; Laurence Housman, *Little Plays of St. Francis*.

Zum Vokalismus von A.E. *tien*, *ten* (Otto Ritter), pp. 155-57.

Zum Cartularium von St. Swithin, Winchester [*Codex Wintoniensis*] (Otto Ritter), pp. 157-59.

Thomas Hardy und Victorien Sardou (Otto Ritter), pp. 159-60.

Parallel between *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* and *Fernande*.

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. VII., February 1925—

The Poet of the "Familiar Style" (Oswald Doughty), pp. 5-10.

The charm of Prior.

*Saint Joan* (J. Kooistra), pp. 11-18.

Critical study of the play.

HERRIGS ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN UND LITERATUREN, Vol. CXLVIII. (new series XLVIII.), February 1925—

Jakob Böhmes Aufnahme in England (Karl Closs), pp. 18-27.  
From the anonymous *Life* of 1644 to William Law.

Byron und die österreichische Polizei (Karl Brunner), pp. 28-41.

Vom englischen Roman der Gegenwart (Bernhard Fehr), pp. 42-9.  
In the main a discussion of Schirmer, *Der englische Roman der Gegenwart*.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXIV., January 1925—

Eclogue Types in English Poetry of the XVIIIth Century (Richard F. Jones), pp. 33-60.

Conventional bucolic, town eclogue and burlesque, political eclogue; growth of eclogue into dramatic scene; native and foreign eclogue, last showing growing romantic spirit.

The Iambic-Trochaic Theory in relation to Musical Notation of Verse (George R. Stewart, Jr.), pp. 61-71.

The Gothic Element in American Literature before 1835 (Oral Sumner Coad), pp. 72-93.

The Excommunicated Jackdaw (Fritz Behrend), pp. 94-101.

Gleanings for the History of a Sentiment: Generositas Virtus, non Sanguis (George M'Gill Vogt), pp. 102-124.

The Lay of Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight (Robert Max Garrett), pp. 125-134.

Circumstances of composition and kinship with Breton lais.

LES LANGUES MODERNES; March 1925—

La poésie de John Masefield: un Roman, *Sard Harker* (G. Joussaume), pp. 121-38.

Special emphasis on the "idealism" of Masefield.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. XXXIX., December 1924—

Shakespeare's Jester: The Dates of *Much Ado* and *As You Like It* (T. W. Baldwin), pp. 447-55.

Conclusions based on dates of Kemp's withdrawal from the Shakespearian company and Armin's entrance.

Mr. Hardy's *Dynasts* as Tragic Drama (Charles E. Whitmore), pp. 455-60.

Some Sociological Aspects of Literary Criticism (Edwin H. Zeydel), pp. 460-66.

The Three Francis Beaumonts (T. W. Baldwin), pp. 505-7.

## MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. XXXIX., January 1925—

A Note on the Towneley *Secunda Pastorum* (Kemp Malone), pp. 35-9.  
Interpretation of "shrewys" and "all wyghtys."

*An Address to the Electors of Great Britain* (Gerard E. Jensen), pp. 57-8.  
Pamphlet possibly by Fielding.

A New Analogue to the *Pardoner's Tale* (Whitney Wells), pp. 58-9.  
Jack London's *Just Meat*.

## February—

Mediaeval Iconography and the Question of Arthurian Origins  
(Roger Sherman Loomis and Arthur C. L. Brown), pp. 65-70.  
Evidence of date of Arthurian sculpture at Modena and Perceval casket at the Louvre for pre-Crestien versions of Arthurian legends.

Mr. John Masefield: A Biographical Note (Stanley P. Chase),  
pp. 84-87.

Teresa Blount and "Alexis" (James T. Hillhouse), pp. 88-91.  
Identification of "Alexis" with Henry Moore, not James Moore-Smythe.

Notes on Old English Poetry (W. S. Mackie), pp. 91-93.  
Exeter Gnostic Verses, 150 ff.; *The Ruin*, 27 f.; *The Wanderer*, 6, 29, 85; *The Rhymed Poem*, 1, 2.

Shakespeare's *Meacocke* (Marie L. C. Linthicum), pp. 96-98.  
Identification of *Meacocke* with *Maycock*, the grey plover.

Notes on Lyly's *Euphues* (W. P. Mustard), pp. 120-21.

## March—

Lydian Airs (Merritt Y. Hughes), pp. 129-37.  
Milton and music.

Aldhelm and the source of *Beowulf* 2523 (A. S. Cook), pp. 137-42.

*The Canon's Yeoman's Tale* (Paull Franklin Baum), pp. 152-54.  
Discussion of problems presented by *Para Secunda*.

Grass and Green Wool (Eleanor Prescott Hammond), pp. 185-86.  
*Flower and the Leaf*, l. 52.

Much Ado about Nothing, V., i. 178 (M. T. Tilley), pp. 186-88.

## MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XX., January 1925—

King Alfred's *Geats* (Kemp Malone), pp. 1-11.  
Suggested explanation of Alfred's use of *Geats* and *Jutes* in his translation of *Bede*.

The "Five Types" in Anglo-Saxon Verse (W. W. Greg), pp. 12-17.

The Text of Spenser's *Complaints* (Bernard E. C. Davis), pp. 18-24.

*Memoirs of a Gentlewoman of the Old School* (Edith Birkhead),  
pp. 25-31.

Mrs. Ann M<sup>c</sup>Taggart's *Memoirs*.

Italian Influence on English Scholarship and Literature during the  
"Romantic Revival" (R. W. King), pp. 48-63.

## MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XX., January 1925—

Middle English "Askances" (Charles H. Livingston), pp. 71-2.

"Scamels" in *The Tempest* (W. A. Osborne), p. 73.

A *Divine Love* addressed by Lord Herbert to Lady Bedford? (J. William Hebel), pp. 74-6.

S. T. Coleridge and the London Philosophical Society (Fannie E. Ratchford), pp. 76-80.

## MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXII., February 1925—

A New Approach to Mediæval Latin Drama (George R. Coffman), pp. 239-71.

Review of Reginald Harvey Griffiths' *Alexander Pope: A Bibliography* (George Sherburn), pp. 327-36.

Has additions to the material given in the book reviewed.

## THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER, Vol. XCVII., January 1925—

Personal Recollections of Tennyson (W. F. Rawnsley), pp. 1-9.

Continued in February, pp. 190-96.

Three Letters of Thomas Campbell (Walter Seton), pp. 33-8.

## ———February———

Francis Jeffrey as a Literary Critic (R. C. Bald), pp. 201-5.

## NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 148, January 3, 1925—

Seventeenth Century Broadside: The Apparition of Old Booty (Rev. J. V. Foote), pp. 5-6.

Further note by W. Courthope Forman, January 17th, p. 49; H. J. Aylliffe, January 31st, p. 84.

## ———January 10———

*The Norwich Gazette*, 1730 (J. Z. C.), pp. 21-3.

Concluded January 17th, pp. 43-5.

Uriconium: Ariconium: Archenfield (Alfred Watkins and St. Clair Baddeley), pp. 29-31.

Continued by St. Clair Baddeley and P. M., January 24th, pp. 68-9; Alfred Watkins, February 7th, p. 106; St. Clair Baddeley, March 14th, pp. 194-95.

## ———January 17———

Christmas Mummers of Stoneleigh (Mary Dormer Harris), pp. 42-3.

## ———January 31———

Four Notes on *Gawayne and the Green Knight* (Beatrice Saxon Snell), p. 75.

Further note on "harled" by W. Self-Weeks, February 14th, p. 122.



NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 148, March 7—

The Pursuit of Shadows (Robert S. Forsythe), pp. 165-67.

Origin of Jonson's *Follow a shadow* and parallels.

—March 14—

W. H. Ireland's *Chatelar* and *Rizzio* (G. Hilder Libbis), p. 183.

Original matter.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. IV., January 1925—

Chaucer's Doctor of Phisyk (Walter Clyde Curry), pp. 1-24.

Study of mediæval medicine.

Horace's Influence on Dryden (Amanda M. Ellis), pp. 39-60.

REVUE ANGLO-AMÉRICAIN, Vol. II., October 1924—

Byron—en 1924 (Maurice Castelain), pp. 1-14.

Thackeray et la société anglaise du XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle (Marguerite Weill), pp. 15-28.

Reasons for the attraction which Thackeray felt towards the XVIIIth century, and study of his works dealing with it.

Le sentiment médiéval en Angleterre au XIX<sup>e</sup> Siècle et la première poésie de William Morris (Suite et fin) (Lucien Wolff), pp. 29-38.

Detailed criticism of *The Defence of Guinevere*, etc.

Greene et Shakespeare (Paul Reyher), pp. 51-4.

Parallels between *As You Like It* and *James the Fourth*.

*L'Île du Docteur Moreau* au Théâtre (Georges Connes), pp. 54-6.

A French dramatic adaptation of Well's *Island of Dr. Moreau*.

—December 1924—

L'œuvre de James Joyce (Louis Cazamian), pp. 97-113.

Les sources du pessimisme de Thomson, I. (Henri Peyre), pp. 152-56.

Concluded in February 1925, pp. 217-31.

Un discours sur Rudyard Kipling et la France (H. Servajean), pp. 157-62.

Extracts from an address to the pupils of the Lycée Saint-Louis.

—February 1925—

La révolte de l'Inde contre Shakespeare (Emile Legouis), pp. 193-203.  
Study of the attacks of Smarajit Dutt on *Othello* and *Macbeth*, and their significance.

J. M. Synge et son œuvre (Simone Téry), pp. 204-216.

Runaways' eyes (Jules Derocquigny), pp. 236-38.

Note on *Romeo and Juliet*, III., ii. 6.

Note sur Shakespeare, Richard II., acte i., scène iii. (G. Lambin), pp. 238-41.

Shakespeare's treatment of the trial by combat, and his sources.

De Peele à Sidney, à propos d'une coquille (G. Lambin), pp. 242-43.

Note on passage in *David and Bethsabe* borrowed from Du Bartas.

## STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXII., January 1925—

The Literary Influences of Philip Freneau (Harry Hayden Clark), pp. 1-33.

Literature and the Law of Libel: Shelley and the Radicals of 1840-42 (Newman I. White), pp. 34-47.

Moxon's trial for blasphemous libel, Hetherington's share in it, and its results.

*Hyperion* (Martha Hale Shackford), pp. 48-60.

Sir Thomas Browne and Seventeenth-Century Scientific Thought (Almonte C. Howell), pp. 61-80.

Browne as "the populariser of science."

The Reputation of the "Metaphysical Poets" during the Age of Johnson and the "Romantic Revival" (Arthur H. Nethercot), pp. 81-132.

## TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, January 1, 1925—

A French Critic? (Margaret Scott), p. 9.

Proof that Swinburne's "French critic" was himself (answer to Alan Harris, T.L.S., December 25, 1924).

The Poet's Poet (Walter Edwin Peck), p. 9.

Origin of phrase.

## —January 8—

The *Midsummer Night's Dream* (Henry Cuningham), p. 24.

Reply to reviewer of "New Cambridge" *Midsummer Night's Dream*, December 18, 1924.

The *Midsummer Night's Dream* (Richmond Noble), p. 24.

"The Song" in Act V. sc. i; and note on Mr. Wilson's textual investigations.

Ben Jonson and Nicholas Hill (Richard F. Patterson), p. 24.

Identification of reference in Jonson's conversations with Drummond.

Dickens's Christmas Numbers (Robert Pierpoint), p. 24.

The authorship of the *All the Year Round* stories.

The Authorship of *Locrine* (Thornton S. Graves), p. 24.

Evidence in favour of Charles Tilney.

## —January 15—

The Shakespeare Signatures (Sir George Greenwood), p. 40.

Discussion continued by J. A. Fort and H. Derwernt Simpson, January 22nd, p. 56; Sir George Greenwood, January 29th, p. 71.

The Text of Milton (H. J. C. Grierson), p. 40.

Note on sonnet *On the Religious Memory of Mrs. Catherine Thomason*.

## —January 22—

A Letter to Byron (C. S. B. Buckland), p. 56.

Hitherto unprinted letter by Hoppner.

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 383

**TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, January 22, 1925—**

Robert Louis Stevenson (John A. Steuart), p. 56.

Further reply to reviewer.

**A *Coriolanus* Crux** (George Herbert Cowling), p. 56.

Emendation of IV., 3, 11.

Misprints corrected, January 29th, p. 71.

—January 29—

Sara Coleridge's Notes (Bernard G. Hall), p. 71.

Notes in a copy of the 1803 *Poems* of Coleridge.

Cotton and Darley (Samuel J. Looker), p. 71.

Parallel poems.

—February 5—

"Distance no Object" (C. T. Onions), p. 88.

Discussion of the development of the phrase. Continued by W. L. Watson,

February 26th, p. 138.

An Essay by Shelley (John M. Turnbull), p. 88.

Note on story included in communication from W. E. Peck, November 27th, 1924. Further note by R. C. Irving, February 12th, p. 104.

—February 12—

A Textual Puzzle in *Much Ado* (Peter Haworth), p. 104.

Suggested emendation of V., 1, 16.

—February 19—

*Macbeth*, IV., 3, 34 (H. C. Lawrence), p. 120.

Discussion continued by Henry Cuninghame, February 26th, p. 138;  
N.W.H., March 5th, p. 156.

*Sanditon* (J. R. Sanders), p. 120.

Possible alternative title in family tradition.

—February 26—

*You Meaner Beauties of the Night* (G. B. Verity), p. 138.

Parallel from Meleager.

Swift's Copy of Dampier (M. R. James), p. 138.

—March 5—

Three Passages of Keats (H. W. Garrod), p. 156.

*I stood tiptoe*, 215-20; *Fall of Hyperion*, 72-7; *Infatuate Britons*, 1.

Discussion continued by C. H. Herford, March 12th, p. 172.

The Wakefield Mysteries (Matthew H. Peacock), p. 156.

New evidence that plays belong to Wakefield and not Woodkirk.

Byron's Lines on Hoppner (Robert S. Forsythe), p. 156.

Bibliographical note.

—March 12—

On a Letter of Keats (J. Middleton Murry), pp. 171-2.

Letter to Jane Reynolds, September 14, 1817.

Discussion continued by H. W. Garrod, March 19th, p. 199.

## TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, March 12, 1925—

William Langland's Birthplace (Allan H. Bright), p. 172.  
Evidence in favour of Ledbury.

## —March 19—

The Composition of *The Prelude* (Professor Ernest de Selincourt),  
p. 196.

Coleridge Bibliography (George P. Winship), p. 199.

Shakespeare's Sonnets (George G. Loane), p. 200.  
Sonnets CV., LXXVII., CXL.

## —March 26—

Some Literary Allusions in *Henry the Fourth* (R. P. Cowl), p. 222.

The Poet Chaucer (Walter Rye), p. 223.  
Family connection with Lynn in Norfolk.

urt),